

KANSAS.

Richard Waring to be postmaster at Abilene, in the county of Dickinson and State of Kansas.

H. J. Muth to be postmaster at La Cygne, in the county of Linn and State of Kansas.

MAINE.

Thomas G. Herbert to be postmaster at Richmond, in the county of Sagadahoc and State of Maine.

MARYLAND.

Marion A. Humphreys to be postmaster at Salisbury, in the county of Wicomico and State of Maryland.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Daniel Bearse to be postmaster at Hyannis, in the county of Barnstable and State of Massachusetts.

MISSISSIPPI.

Ellis E. Perkins to be postmaster at Edwards, in the county of Hinds and State of Mississippi.

NEW MEXICO.

Paul A. F. Walter to be postmaster at Santa Fe, N. Mex.

NEW YORK.

Henry C. Getter to be postmaster at Middleburg, in the county of Schoharie and State of New York.

TENNESSEE.

D. A. Tate to be postmaster at South Pittsburg, in the county of Marion and State of Tennessee.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, May 24, 1906.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, the Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Journal be approved.

The motion was agreed to.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 19264) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I call for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 121, noes 37.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the point of order, I now call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, there is no quorum present.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The point of no quorum present has been made, and under that rule the doors will be closed and the Sergeant-at-Arms will bring in absentees. As many as are in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania will, as their names are called, answer "aye;" as many as are opposed will answer "no;" those not voting will answer "present," and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 223, nays 21, answered "present" 19, not voting 118, as follows:

YEAS—223.

Adams, Pa.	Capron	Fassett	Hay
Alexander	Cassel	Fitzgerald	Hayes
Allen, Me.	Chaney	Fletcher	Hedge
Bannon	Clayton	Flood	Hedlin
Bartholdt	Cole	Fordney	Henry, Conn.
Bates	Cooper, Pa.	Foster, Ind.	Hepburn
Bede	Ccooper, Wis.	Foster, Vt.	Hermann
Beidler	Cousins	Fowler	Higgins
Bennett, Ky.	Cromer	French	Hill, Conn.
Bingham	Crumpacker	Fulkerson	Hinshaw
Birdsall	Curtis	Gaines, W. Va.	Hoar
Bishop	Cushman	Garber	Hogg
Bonyng	Dalzell	Gardner, Mass.	Holliday
Boutell	Darragh	Gardner, Mich.	Houston
Bowersock	Davis, Minn.	Garner	Howard
Brantley	Davis, W. Va.	Garrett	Howell, N. J.
Brooks, Colo.	Dawes	Gilbert, Ky.	Howell, Utah
Brown	Dawson	Gillett, Cal.	Hubbard
Brownlow	De Armond	Gillett, Mass.	Hull
Buckman	Deemer	Glass	Humphrey, Wash.
Burke, Pa.	Denby	Goebel	Hunt
Burleson	Dixon, Ind.	Graff	Jenkins
Burton, Del.	Dixon, Mont.	Graham	Jones, Wash.
Burton, Ohio	Dresser	Granger	Kelifer
Calder	Dunwell	Grosvenor	Keliber
Calderhead	Edwards	Hale	Kennedy, Nebr.
Campbell, Kans.	Ellerbe	Hamilton	Kinkaid
Campbell, Ohio	Ellis	Hardwick	Klepper
Candler	Esch	Haugen	Kline

XL—461

Knowland
Lafean
Lamar
Lawn
Lawrence
Lee
Le Fevre
Lester
Lewis
Lilley, Conn.
Lilley, Pa.
Lindsay
Littauer
Livingston
Lloyd
Longworth
Lorimer
Loud
Loudenslager
Loving
McCall
McCleary, Minn.
McGavin
McKinlay, Cal.
McKinley, Ill.
McKinney
McLachlan

McNary
Madden
Mahon
Mann
Marshall
Maynard
Miller
Minor
Mondell
Moon, Pa.
Moon, Tenn.
Mouser
Mudd
Murdock
Murphy
Needham
Nevin
Norris
Olmsted
Otjen
Padgett
Palmer
Parker
Parsons
Payne
Perkins
Pollard

Prince
Rainey
Reeder
Reynolds
Rhodes
Richardson, Ala.
Rixey
Rodenberg
Rucker
Samuel
Scott
Shackleford
Sherley
Sims
Slayden
Slomp
Smith, Cal.
Smith, Ill.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Samuel W.
Smith, Tex.
Smyser
Southard
Southwick
Sperry
Stafford
Steenerson

Stephens, Tex.
Stevens, Minn.
Sullivan, Mass.
Sulloway
Talbot
Tawney
Taylor, Ohio
Thomas, Ohio
Tirrell
Townsend
Tyndall
Volstead
Wachter
Waldo
Wallace
Watkins
Watson
Weeks
Weems
Wiley, Ala.
Wiley, N. J.
Williams
Wilson
Wood, N. J.
Young
Zenor

NAYS—21.

Beall, Tex.
Bowers
Broocks, Tex.
Clark, Fla.
Clark, Mo.
Floyd

Gillespie
Gregg
Henry, Tex.
Humphreys, Miss.
Kitchin, Claude
McLain
Macon
Page
Patterson, S. C.
Robinson, Ark.
Russell
Spight

Stanley
Towne
Underwood

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—19.

Acheson
Andrus
Bartlett
Brick
Davey, La.

Dickson, Ill.
Driscoll
Fuller
Galnes, Tenn.
Hopkins
Johnson
Morrell
Sherman
Sparkman
Taylor, Ala.

Wanger
Welborn
Wood, Mo.
Woodyard

NOT VOTING—118.

Adams, Wis.
Adamson
Aiken
Allen, N. J.
Ames
Babcock
Bankhead
Barchfeld
Bell, Ga.
Bennet, N. Y.
Blackburn
Bowie
Bradley
Broussard
Brundidge
Burgess
Burke, S. Dak.
Burleigh
Burnett
Butler, Pa.
Butler, Tenn.
Byrd
Chapman
Cockran
Cocks
Conner
Currier
Dale
Davidson
Dovener

Draper
Dwight
Field
Finley
Flack
Foss
Gardner, N. J.
Gilbert, Ind.
Gill
Goldfogle
Goulden
Greene
Griggs
Gronna
Gudger
Haskins
Hearst
Hill, Miss.
Hitt
Huff
Hughes
James
Jones, Va.
Kahn
Kennedy, Ohio
Ketcham
Kitchin, Wm. W.
Knapp
Knopf
Lacey
Lamb
Landis, Chas. B.
Landis, Frederick
Legare
Lever
Little
Littlefield
McCarthy
McCreary, Pa.
McDermott
McMorran
Martin
Meyer
Michalek
Moore
Olcott
Overstreet
Patterson, N. C.
Patterson, Tenn.
Pearre
Pou
Powers
Pujo
Randell, Tex.
Ransdell, La.
Reid
Rhinoek
Richardson, Ky.
Rives
Roberts

Robertson, La.
Ruppert
Ryan
Schneebell
Scroggy
Shartel
Sheppard
Sibley
Small
Smith, Ky.
Smith, Md.
Smith, Wm. Alden
Smith, Pa.
Snapp
Southall
Sterling
Sullivan, N. Y.
Sulzer
Thomas, N. C.
Trimble
Van Duzer
Van Winkle
Vreeland
Wadsworth
Webb
Webber
Weisse
Wharton

A quorum present.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

For the session:

Mr. BRADLEY with Mr. GOULDEN.

Mr. CURRIER with Mr. FINLEY.

Mr. CHAPMAN with Mr. HOPKINS.

Mr. SHERMAN with Mr. RUPPERT.

Mr. WANGER with Mr. ADAMSON.

Mr. MORRELL with Mr. SULLIVAN of New York.

Mr. FOSS with Mr. MEYER.

Until further notice:

Mr. KNOPF with Mr. WEISSE.

Mr. HITT with Mr. LEGARE.

Mr. HUFF with Mr. WOOD of Missouri.

Mr. DOVENER with Mr. SPARKMAN.

Mr. GREENE with Mr. PATTERSON of North Carolina.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota with Mr. DAVEY of Louisiana.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania with Mr. BARTLETT.

Mr. DRISCOLL with Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana.

Mr. DALE with Mr. BOWIE.

Mr. SHARTEL with Mr. LITTLE.

Mr. HASKINS with Mr. LEVER.

Mr. POWERS with Mr. GAINES of Tennessee.

Mr. REYNOLDS with Mr. McDERMOTT.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH with Mr. SHEPPARD.

Mr. DRAPER with Mr. FIELD.

Mr. WELBORN with Mr. GUDGER.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD with Mr. SMITH of Kentucky.

Mr. ANDRUS with Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina.

Mr. ALLEN of New Jersey with Mr. BUTLER of Tennessee.
Mr. BABCHFELD with Mr. HEARST.
Mr. GRONNA with Mr. HILL of Mississippi.
Until Tuesday:

Mr. WEEKS with Mr. STANLEY.

For the vote:

Mr. AMES with Mr. BANKHEAD.
Mr. ROBERTS with Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana.
Mr. SCHNEEBELI with Mr. RYAN.
Mr. VREELAND with Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama.

For the day:

Mr. KETCHAM with Mr. COCKRAN.
Mr. LACEY with Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee.
Mr. BLACKBURN with Mr. SMALL.
Mr. RIVES with Mr. GRIGGS.
Mr. OLCOTT with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.
Mr. FULLER with Mr. RICHARDSON of Kentucky.
Mr. DICKSON of Illinois with Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN.
Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin with Mr. AIKEN.
Mr. BABCOCK with Mr. JONES of Virginia.
Mr. BENNET of New York with Mr. BELL of Georgia.
Mr. BURLEIGH with Mr. BROUSSARD.
Mr. COCKS with Mr. BRUNDIDGE.
Mr. CONNER with Mr. BURGESS.
Mr. DAVIDSON with Mr. BURNETT.
Mr. DWIGHT with Mr. BYRD.
Mr. GILBERT of Indiana with Mr. GILL.
Mr. KAHN with Mr. JAMES.
Mr. KENNEDY of Ohio with Mr. LAMB.
Mr. KNAPP with Mr. REID.
Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS with Mr. POU.
Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. TRIMBLE.
Mr. MCCREARY of Pennsylvania with Mr. PUJO.
Mr. MCMORRAN with Mr. MOORE.
Mr. FREDERICK LANDIS with Mr. RANDELL of Texas.
Mr. PEARRE with Mr. RHINOCK.
Mr. SIBLEY with Mr. SULZER.
Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania with Mr. SOUTHALL.
Mr. STERLING with Mr. SMITH of Maryland.
Mr. VAN WINKLE with Mr. WEBB.
Mr. WADSWORTH with Mr. VAN DUZER.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

So the motion was agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 19264—the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill—with Mr. CURTIS in the chair.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TOWNE]. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. TOWNE. Mr. Chairman, I desire, with the indulgence of the committee, to submit to the House, and incidentally to the country, some considerations why, in my opinion, the Republican party ought to be driven from power, and why the Democratic party should be intrusted with the control of the National Government. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.] This country, sir, is under a government of parties. Any system of free government is necessarily a party government, because such a government, as has been said, is a government of opinion; and in order that any given opinion shall find expression in legislation and administration it must first commend itself to the judgment, and receive the support, of a majority of those who are entitled to express opinion at the polls. This procedure necessarily implies organization; it implies an appeal to the reason and the conscience of the citizen.

Here, sir, I pause a moment to comment upon a very curious anomaly in our politics. Nothing is more common in the flippancy of party enthusiasm than attacks upon men who, for one reason or another, have changed their political affiliations. And yet the entire practical conduct of our partisan politics is based upon the theory that citizens may be induced to change their partisan associations; that it is not only advisable for them occasionally to do so, but is in the highest degree meritorious and patriotic. The organization of campaign committees, the collection and disbursement of moneys, the printing and circulation of literature, the torch-light processions, and the eloquent appeals of orators, are all addressed to the judgment of the individual citizen, and in the name of the welfare of the country.

I have had, sir, some special experience in this connection that I should not call to the attention of the House but for the fact that from time to time it has been made the subject of more or less pointed, and now and then humorous, reference upon the other side of this chamber. For a moment I desire particularly to advert to a speech which you will find in the

Record of the 28th of April, by the distinguished humorist and chosen protectionist champion from the State of Washington—Mr. CUSHMAN. That gentleman declared himself in that speech to be a warm personal friend of mine. I am happy to state that I thoroughly reciprocate his disposition. I may add also that I do not take his humor any too seriously. It was expected of him, and he did the best within his power to rise to the expectation of those who had put him forward as the funny champion of a desperate cause. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The immediate occasion of his reference to myself was the fact of my having rendered, and very gladly rendered, some assistance to the distinguished leader of the minority [Mr. WILLIAMS] in the course of his address on the subject of the tariff. Mr. WILLIAMS, owing to a slight physical indisposition, requested me to read for him certain excerpts from various authorities with which he desired to enforce and illustrate his argument. Referring to this circumstance, the gentleman from Washington said:

I was particularly interested to note that the distinguished gentleman, formerly from Minnesota and now a Member from New York [Mr. TOWNE], was called upon to read these extracts. This hydra-headed performance seemed all the more remarkable to me when I recalled the fact that only a few years ago that same gentleman [Mr. TOWNE] occupied a seat on this, the Republican, side of this House and was one of the ardent champions of a protective tariff. And when he bade farewell to the Republican party he announced that he only did so on the single issue of money.

For a moment I shall pause at this point in the gentleman's speech and address myself very briefly to the campaign of 1896, to which reference has been made both in the speech to which I am now calling the attention of the House, and in the brilliant address of the eloquent gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS] on yesterday. It is true, Mr. Chairman, that the immediate occasion of my departure from the Republican party was the action of that party upon the subject of bimetalism. It is, however, due to the truth and the philosophy of history, as well as to a vindication of my own conduct, to call the attention of the House to the fact that the position of the Republican party on the money question was only a specific evidence of its generic abandonment of the cause of the people in every particular. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.] There is not one single important proposition recognized to-day as a crucial Republican doctrine that is not in direct conflict with the teaching of that party on the same subject during its heroic days. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.] It is true that I left that party because of its action on the money question; but if I had not left it then I should have had occasion fifty times to leave it since. [Renewed applause on the Democratic side.] It is, I think, proper also that I should remind the House that I did not quit the Republican party in order to get an office, but that I laid down an office when I left the party. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I was a member of this House from a Republican district, with nearly 10,000 Republican majority at my back, and if I had chosen to take the prescription made for me, and to obey the dictation of the leaders of that party, I could have continued to be a member of this House from the State of Minnesota, and a Republican of good standing, for fifty years. [Applause.]

At the risk of spending somewhat too much time on a matter now chiefly historic and academic, I wish to refresh the memories of members of this House in regard to certain features of that great campaign of 1896. While listening to the address of the whirlwind orator from the Wabash [Mr. LANDIS] on yesterday, I was amazed to find how dense was the ignorance that still remained in an exceptionally brilliant Republican intellect upon the subject of the coinage, at a distance of ten years from that campaign of education. [Applause on the Democratic side.] In answer to an interruption by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS], referring in general words to the position of the Democratic party in that campaign, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] declared that in that campaign the Democratic party stood for the silver standard and against the gold standard; and when his attention was directed to the declarations on the subject of bimetalism in various Republican platforms, he displayed an emphatic antipathy to interruption and made no satisfactory reply to his interrogator. The proposition of the Democratic party in 1896, of which, sir, with others, I was a somewhat strenuous supporter, was not to establish the silver standard but to restore silver to equal power and dignity with gold as a money metal. The proposition was not a novel one. It had been the historic and settled policy of every political party in this country for many years preceding that campaign. When, with many others in the Republican party, I contended, in 1896, that the money function should be restored to silver on a parity with gold, I was in exact accord with the national platform of my party on that subject. In this connection I read another sentence from the brilliant

speech of the humorous gentleman from Washington [Mr. CUSHMAN]. After paying to my voice a compliment which modesty will not let me accept, and which courtesy to the gentleman will not allow me to refuse [laughter], he said:

And the only conclusion I could come to was that the use of one single voice in speaking for all political parties and on all sides of all questions has tended to cultivate the gentleman's voice to a point of perfection that the more modest of us can never hope to attain.

This observation, it is recorded by the official stenographer, was followed by "great laughter" on the Republican side of the House. What they laughed at Heaven only knows; but it would be futile to seek a reason for many of the risible manifestations of satisfaction on that side of the Chamber. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Earlier in these remarks I made the proposition that political party organization implies the right and the duty upon the part of an honest man now and then to change his party allegiance. This change may be due to increased reflection, to better information, or to the development of new issues upon which not the same opinions are entertained among men who have been of the same persuasion in regard to questions previously at stake. I do not consider it at all an impugning of an honest man's character that he should change his party allegiance, but rather a vindication thereof. Every man should seek, to the limit of his capacity, to have a correct opinion. He is entitled to any opinion at all only upon that condition. But he should always have the courage of his conclusions; and if new facts, or more mature consideration lead him to change his judgment, it is not only not an occasion of reproach, but it is one of commendation. Nevertheless, sir, I wish to say that in regard to every great political principle I ever avowed or felt I stand to-day exactly where I stood when I avowed and felt it. I was born back in the historic days of the Republican party. My infancy was nurtured under the benign influences of its most heroic leadership. My earliest recollections are of the friends and companions of the immortal Abraham Lincoln, whose broad general beliefs and sympathies were more nearly akin than those of any other great statesman of our history to the beliefs and sympathies of the illustrious founder of the Democratic party, Thomas Jefferson. [Applause on the Democratic side.] These sir, I inherited. They inspired my youth. I grew to manhood cherishing them. I entertain them to-day, but I had to get out of the Republican party in order to entertain and avow them honestly. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If the gentleman from Washington [Mr. CUSHMAN], or any other gentleman on that side of the House, and I hope the gentleman from Washington will forgive me for taking him seriously in this one matter, really means to insinuate that anywhere or at any time I have espoused and advocated, upon any great political question, a side opposed to that which I have anywhere else or at any other time espoused and advocated, I desire him here and now to tell me and this House where and when it was and what the subject was. [Turning to the Republican side.] If any of you claim to know, let me know, and if you do not know, do not say you know. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Let me call attention to this paragraph in the Republican national platform of 1888:

The Republican party is in favor of the use of both gold and silver as money, and condemns the policy of the Democratic administration in its efforts to demonetize silver.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

And I read further from the corresponding plank in the Republican national platform of 1892:

The American people, from tradition and interest, favor bimetallicism and demand the use of both gold and silver as standard money.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Those utterances, sir, embody the doctrine which I advocated in 1896, both before the meeting of the national Republican convention and afterwards during that most interesting campaign. But that is the doctrine which the Republican party denounced in its platform of 1896, and strenuously opposed in the campaign of that year. Let me now ask the gentleman from Washington, who has been talking on two sides of that question, the Republican party or the gentleman from New York? [Applause on the Democratic side.] I shall not for the moment argue the justice of the proposition; I am not now concerned with the merits; I seek at present merely to place absolutely beyond all cavil or denial the fact that the Republican party did change its position on that fundamental monetary question. But, you may say, may not a party, like an individual, change its opinions? And I answer frankly, "Yes; to be sure; but that the change of the party is not obligatory upon one single member of it who remains in his own judgment of the same opinion as before." So far as I am con-

cerned, my opinions are free, and they are my own, and I shall always go where I can advocate them without restraint in the hope of giving them most effect in behalf of my country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, sir, briefly, what was the contention in the campaign of 1896? I desire frankly to admit, so far as I am concerned, that the Democratic party made a serious tactical error in the enunciation of its position on the coinage question. It was, in my opinion, a mistake to put into the platform a declaration in favor of the ratio of 16 to 1, or, indeed, of any other ratio whatever. When that declaration had once been made I, indeed, argued for it. I endeavored here upon this floor, as some of you will remember, perhaps, wearisomely, for some three or four hours, to establish that it was a practicable proposition, although not a necessary one, for the realization of the principle and the practical benefits of bimetallicism. We assumed an unnecessary burden in apparently identifying the principle of bimetallicism with the incident of the ratio between the two metals. While I have always believed that the United States could have maintained the ratio of 16 to 1, I was perfectly willing, in order to secure a permanent par between gold and silver throughout the world, and a settlement of that vexatious question for fifty or a hundred years, to permit the ratio to be fixed at any compromise point within a considerable range, as, for example, at 22 to 1, which, in 1900, would have preserved the then existing commercial exchange between London and India.

In the latter year I urged strenuously that the declaration for the ratio of 16 to 1 be not included in the platform, contending that we should plant ourselves squarely upon a declaration of the quantitative theory, the generic principle of a corresponding increase of money with which to do business along with the increase of the business requiring to be done, and that we leave the ratio to the determination of statesmen under conditions as they might appear. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now, the simple fact is that this proposition was predicated upon a principle of political economy, from which there never had been a dissenting voice among the political philosophers of the world in any language or in any country from the time of Aristotle down to 1896—the simple principle that you can not do more business with less money without lowering prices. We declared that we wished to reclothe silver with monetary dignity and capacity equivalent with gold, for the reason that for twenty-five years, with here and there a pause and eddy in the current, there had been a continued progressive fall of prices, a phenomenon which every economist that ever wrote with any authority has declared to be the same thing as the rise of the purchasing power of money, an increase in the value of the monetary substance. We saw no way to stop the fall of prices, except by increasing the quantity of the stuff in which prices were measured. What was your answer to this demand?

Now, I am anxious to nail you gentlemen on this proposition right here; and I wish my distinguished friend from Minnesota [Mr. McCLEARY], who, as I understand it, is to follow me in this debate, would attend to this point and state whether or not I correctly represent the attitude that he and his party then took in regard to it. You declared to us that there was money enough; that you did not need any more; and the most of you, together with nearly all your great editorial writers, committed yourselves unreservedly to the contention that there is no discoverable relation between the quantity of money in circulation and the range of prices. In the calm of the present, far removed from the heat and excitement of that great campaign, it seems strange that you could possibly have committed yourselves to a theory so absolutely at war with common sense and universal experience. Yet, for the verity of the statement that you did so commit yourselves, I appeal to the whole body of literature contemporaneous with that campaign. The then President of the United States himself stated in a message to Congress that we did not need any more money; that the only thing necessary was an access of general confidence—praying for confidence at the precise time when there was nothing to have confidence in. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The only time when confidence was needed was exactly when there was a confession by those who called for it that there was nothing for it to rest on. But perhaps there has never been a greater exhibition of the irony of politics than that which followed the campaign of 1896. You gentlemen who succeeded in persuading the people that they did not need any more money, and declared so strenuously that you did not want any more, began shortly to witness, with commendable resignation, an unprecedented increase in its supply. It was the only thing that saved your party from absolute annihilation. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I declare with the sanction of all the teachings of all the economists and of all the experience of the

commercial world from the beginning of time, that the vastly augmented and continued increase in the world's stock of gold following the campaign of 1896, and continuing to this hour, has been the only thing that saved this country, the only thing that saved the civilized world, from the most gigantic financial cataclysm that history has recorded. [Applause on the Democratic side.] With the increased capitalization of our modern business contrivances, the multiplication of corporations, the vast development of the world's business, with the attendant unprecedented increase in liquid debts evidenced by securities of every conceivable sort held as investments all over the world; if you had continued to expand that overblown fabric of confidence, resting upon a constantly relatively diminishing basis of ultimate money, you would have wrecked the commercial institutions of mankind amid universal calamity. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The increased production of gold saved you from yourselves. You were the beneficiaries of your own fatuous ignorance. The most of you did not then know what you wanted and do not now know what you got. [Applause from the Democratic side.] We declared that to stop the fall of prices it was necessary to have more ultimate or basic money. We could not see any place to get it except to coin again a metal which for four thousand years had been money, and which, whenever permitted free access to the mints along with gold, and an equal monetary function under the law, had maintained itself at a practical parity with the other metal. Now, my Republican friends, please remember that your answer to our contention for more ultimate money was, not that you were going to get it from an increased production of gold or from somewhere else except from the silver mines, but that you did not want to get it at all. You had money enough, you said. Now, therefore, let me in all candor inquire what business you have to compliment yourselves over the increased gold supply and the prosperity that came with it? And yet I have heard distinguished Republican orators claiming this augmented gold supply as among the assets of Republican statesmanship and of the McKinley administration, along with the sunshine and the rain, our unequalled productivity of soil and climate, our unparalleled mineral resources, the multifarious talents of the most enlightened and enterprising people the world ever saw. This phenomenon, my friends, saved your faces as well as your offices. The people, mistakenly in my judgment, at the time decided not to open the mint, but heaven decided to open the mines. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Providence was both wiser and kinder than you. From our point of view it made no difference whether this access of basic money came from one metal or the other, or from both, provided only that the total quantity clothed with full monetary power sufficed for the maintenance of a practical level of average prices; and I have never at any time or place said anything inconsistent with this proposition.

It is beside the point to quote, as if they convicted us of inconsistency, some of the statements made by men on this side as to the calamity that would follow the perpetuation of the gold standard; for everybody knows that these predictions were based upon what everybody on both sides of the question at that time contemplated—the assumption of a continued relative decline in the output of gold. Nobody could dip into the future and foretell the secrets of science that should render profitable hitherto unworkable deposits of gold, and nobody could see into the almost limitless treasures on the frozen banks of the Yukon or in the deep recesses of the Witwaters Rand. So great was the increase of gold production that my friend, who now does me the honor to attend to what I am saying, the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], who was a member of the House in those days, said upon a certain occasion that the gold coming to the mints of the United States during a few years succeeding the campaign of 1896 involved a greater addition in dollars to the basic money supply of the country than would have been realized if the gold supply had continued on its old plane before 1896 and we had supplemented it with the free coinage of silver. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I did not intend, sir, to spend so much time on this subject. It is now merely a part of the history of our politics. Certain references to myself in connection with it, however, seemed to me not only to justify but to require that I should say what I have said. In addition I desire merely to affirm my belief that *in principle* the Democratic party stands to-day on that great subject precisely where it stood in 1896. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now let me call particular attention to the fact that I have just said that the *principle* for which we contended then we contend for now. We are not now asking the free coinage of silver. We do not need the free coinage of silver at this time. The principle we contend for is merely this: That so far as the Government concerns itself with pro-

viding a monetary system for the country, it should endeavor to maintain such a system as shall be equitable between debtor and creditor. We want neither an appreciating money nor a depreciating money. A system that shall do exact justice is of course impossible. An approximation is the best that can be achieved. But it must be borne in mind that the principle of justice requires that the money of the country shall be, as nearly as the function of government can make it so, a just measure of the values of the things which are exchanged by means of it and of the debts and burdens expressed in terms of it; and that the Democratic party, if in control of the Government, will always employ its total powers within their constitutional limit, to produce this result. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Frankly, let me say, I expect never to see the coinage question raised again as it was presented in 1896. I have attempted to give some attention to the study of the production of gold, to its geology and location, and to its treatment; and my opinion is that the world's output of gold will, for an indefinite number of years, continue to increase not only absolutely but relatively; and it is altogether likely that if there is ever another contest in this country upon the coinage question it will be precipitated from your side by a proposition to restrict the coinage of gold. [Applause.] For, if this indicated increase in the production shall come to pass, it is reasonably certain that the great creditor class of the world will order you so to restrict the coinage, and if you are so ordered you will march up and do it if there are enough of you left to carry out the order. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, this question has been settled by a decree to which all parties must bow. Under present conditions I, for one, am satisfied with it. The record of the Democratic party in regard to this question is consistent; but it is the duty of a party to be abreast of the practical issues of the present hour. As a matter of immediate practical concern it is relatively immaterial whether, upon a great question of the past, the attitude of the Democratic party was right or wrong. What is pertinent at this moment is, What are the live questions of this hour; where does the Republican party stand in regard to them, and what does the Democratic party propose to do about them? And this, sir, brings me to consider certain topics as to which the consistency of my position has been further challenged. After stating that I had claimed to leave the Republican party "on the single issue of money" the gentleman from Washington [Mr. CUSHMAN] continued:

And yet, after affiliating with that party and indorsing one political heresy, the gentleman seems to have let all holds go and embraced all their heresies, including free trade.

Waiving, for the present, the truth of this accusation, let me remark that if I had changed my opinions in regard to the great subject of the tariff I might plead in exculpation the precedent of some very illustrious examples. I hold in my hand a very interesting compilation, made by a competent and honest man, and, as to the extracts I shall read to you, verified by myself, containing certain of the expressions of alleged belief to which utterance has been given at divers times and places by the gentleman who is at the present moment the exalted Chief Magistrate of the United States. [Laughter and applause.] From this compilation I read a short extract taken from "Roosevelt's Life of Benton," at page 67 (of the first edition, I believe):

Political economists have pretty generally agreed that protection is vicious in theory and harmful in practice;

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

but if the majority of the people in interest wish it, and it affects only themselves, there is no earthly reason why they should not be allowed to try the experiment to their hearts' content.

[Applause.]

I next read from the same eminent authority a short extract from a speech delivered July 24, 1904, in acceptance of the Republican nomination for the Presidency:

That whenever the need arises there should be a readjustment of the tariff schedules is undoubted, but such changes can with safety be made only by those whose devotion to the principle of a high protective tariff is beyond question, for otherwise the changes would amount not to a readjustment, but to repeal. The readjustment, when made, must maintain and not destroy the protective principle.

I refrain at present from continuing the "deadly parallel" in regard to other subjects from the same high source—it can be illustrated, I believe, with any subject to which he ever gave expression [laughter and applause on the Democratic side], including the railroad rate bill [renewed laughter and applause]—and will comment for a moment upon the great question upon which this comparison of views is cited. I think it was Edmund Burke who declared that he had for practical

political purposes very little use for general maxims, and every public man's experience must, I think, have taught him the peril that lies in the generality and brevity of an epithet.

The words "protection" and "free trade," "protectionist" and "free trader" have been much misused. For myself I will not permit my beliefs to be misrepresented by the employment of them. My position on the great fiscal question to which the raising of duties upon imports has given so large an importance during our history was taken early, but after the most careful investigation I was then able to bestow upon it. While a student at the University of Michigan I pursued, under a very distinguished economist, one of the ablest in this country, Dr. Henry C. Adams, well known as the statistician of the Interstate Commerce Commission, a course in advanced political economy. Of course, one of the principal subjects to which we gave our attention was that of protection versus free trade, and at the conclusion of our studies we were asked to write, respectively, upon a sheet of paper for the information of the professor the designation of our belief as to that great controversy. Every man in the class, with two exceptions, wrote himself down as a free trader. One other student, now a practicing lawyer in the city of Washington, and myself dissented from this preponderant judgment. We called ourselves neither "protectionists" nor "free traders," but "nationalists." By that designation, as I then conceived it and as I conceive it now, was indicated those who believe that it is the function of the closet philosopher, the theoretical political economist, to collect, examine, classify, and systematize the complicated data of economic science and to formulate and announce the abstract laws of wealth, of the acquisition, distribution, or exchange, and consumption of utilities calculated to meet human wants. It is, on the other hand, and this is a matter, as I view it, of great importance, the business of the statesman to take the abstract principles established by the political economist and apply them to the concrete conditions of his people in his day.

Aristotle gave expression to this idea when he said that the maker of laws must always have in mind two things, the people and the country. Now, sir, what tariff schedules shall be enforced at any one time in any one country and under any given conditions, and what shall be enforced at another time in another country under different conditions, can not be determined by any *a priori* formula in the world. It is a question of circumstances as they exist at the time and in the place when and where you are to apply the law to them. You can not make trade absolutely "free," either now or at any other time short of the millenium. There are always two ends to a bargain, and when the bargain is international there is one end of the trade your local law can not reach. Again, it will happen that legislation which at one time would be described as protective may perform the function of making trade more free, and it may happen at another time that laws enacted in the name of free trade may actually extend protection over the industries to which they apply. For example, when, just before the middle of the last century, Great Britain vastly lowered her tariff barriers and started out as the evangel of freer trade among the nations, she had, owing to the more rapid concentration of capital within her borders than had taken place elsewhere in the world, and to the relatively wide extension and development of the factory system with its machinery and its subdivision of labor, reached a stage of productive capacity far in advance of any other nation in the world. She had, as I remember to have seen it stated, with a population of some 20,000,000 of people, a productive capacity of 450,000,000 pairs of human hands.

The highest protection that under those conditions could be extended to her industry consisted in making more free the avenues and opportunities for exchanging its products. On the other hand, in the early history of the United States, when capital was almost nonexistent; when natural resources, though manifold and tremendous, were undeveloped; when population was scarce and industry undifferentiated; to have left trade nominally "free" would have been actually to subject it almost absolutely to the control of nations with more concentration of capital and more highly organized industries. Accordingly, legislation which "protected" those industries really "freed" them from harsh conditions and permitted them to grow.

The words "protection" and "free trade," as they are so generally and loosely used, are both, in my opinion, capable of infinite mischief. A man may very consistently be a protectionist at one time and a free-trader at another for the very sufficient reason that the same conditions of public policy and advantage may dictate one policy at one time and another at another. This is the reasonable and practical position of the

national economist. A man who proclaims himself to be at all times and under all circumstances a protectionist, and the man also who proclaims himself as always a free-trader, both stultify themselves. When, for example, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] declared yesterday, "I am a high protectionist," he said in effect that he was not only for protection but for high protection once, next, and last, first, all the time, and forever. There is no ambiguity about that declaration. It may not be intelligent but it is intelligible. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

There has been, I regret to say, a somewhat similar carelessness in the use of language on the part of Democratic writers and speakers. They have not been so scrupulous about their terminology as the cunning and resourcefulness of their opponents should have admonished them to be. In stating their position against that kind of protection for which the Republican party now stands, they have permitted themselves too often to employ language which could be used, and which has been used, with much success by our opponents as ground for accusing us of a determination to level all the custom-houses with the ground, and, in case we came into power, to paralyze the industries of the country with a programme of change so radical as to amount to demolition. The people of the United States are not wedded to the kind of protection doctrine for which the Republican party now stands. They want that system reformed. They would long ago have committed its reformation to the Democratic party if you Republicans had not succeeded in persuading them that the Democrats meant not reform but destruction.

I desire, with some emphasis, if with propriety I may venture to do so, to warn some of my Democratic friends against the danger of loose and careless expressions on this great subject. The American people will never reform the tariff with the ax and the torch. You must see to it that they do not have reasonable cause to believe that to be your intention. There is not a real free-trader in the nation; or at least if there is, there isn't another one. The gentleman from Indiana attempts to raise a false issue when he represents the struggle as impending between theoretical protection on the one hand and theoretical free trade on the other.

This cry has frequently deceived the people in the past, but I think it is now a useless slogan. No responsible Democrat contends for free trade or for any approach to it as a measure for either immediate or proximate policy. The distinguished leader of the minority of this House [Mr. WILLIAMS] does not contend for it. The Southern people are not for it. Even the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARKE], to whom in times past there has been wrongly imputed a certain strenuousness in the direction of theoretical free trade, declared in a speech in this House on the 8th of January:

A reasonable revision of the exorbitant Dingley rates is a Democratic proposition, not Republican.

The apologists and eulogists of the present system will make a serious mistake if they think they can go before the American people in the coming Congressional campaign, and in the great contest of 1908, and ignore the abuses of that system whose knowledge is common property throughout the land. They can not distract the attention of the people from its hideous features by pointing to a bogey-man of their own creation, and crying hysterically, "Free trade!" "Free trade!" The issue, let it be constantly repeated and emphasized, is not between protection and free trade, it is between the perpetuation of the present exaggerated protection, which produces and fosters monopoly, on the one hand, and on the other hand a fair and just revision of the tariff schedules in the interest of the general welfare. The former is the Republican programme, the latter the Democratic. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, the present attitude of the Republican party on this great fiscal question is another illustration of the charge I made a few minutes ago that the Republican party had changed its position on substantially all its original characteristic doctrines. To most of you gentlemen on that side of the House the attitude of your party as a champion of protection for protection's sake seems quite fundamental; but your party did not begin with believing that. You have grown into it by a natural process of assimilation to those who have come to own you. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In this connection I dislike to impair the force and destroy the novelty of the very eloquent address which is later in the day to be delivered by the distinguished champion of protection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], of whose speech scheduled for this afternoon a partial, and, I am sure, a very inadequate résumé, has already been printed, under some failure to connect, or rather an overscrupulousness to connect, in the Philadelphia Inquirer of this morning. [Laughter.] Now [taking up the paper], I am not going to read this speech to

you. I want the gentleman to have all the novelty of effect in its delivery that his personal equation of advocacy can impart to it, especially as there is no novelty in the doctrine. The headlines are themselves interesting. The honorable gentleman from Pennsylvania did not write the headlines, but the man who did write them knew exactly what Dalzell would say. How did he know? Why, because he knew what ought to be said; because every Republican in Pennsylvania always knows what ought to be said on this subject, because they have been saying the same thing for the last sixty years up in Pennsylvania. It is simply impossible for them to learn that the country is getting tired of this exaggerated Pennsylvania way of looking at things. The headlines begin by stating in big type, "Dalzell rakes the revisionists." [Laughter.]

I may remark in passing that, curiously enough, since rakes are a specialty of recent Republican information, they do not specify the kind of rake he uses. "Opposes changes to humor importers." There is an ambiguity here which the gentleman ought to correct. It leaves uncertain whether he opposes changes in order to humor the importers or whether he opposes changes that are designed to humor the importers. That certainly was a bad break by the headline writer. "Opposes changes to humor importers and a lean party thirst for power." It is rather odd, Mr. Chairman, that long exclusion from power, making a party thirsty, should for that reason necessarily taint every principle advocated by the party so excluded; but it seems to me far more doubtful that long possession of power, absolute plethora of the good things of place, and an overfed satiety should still leave an especial mental acuteness for the consideration of these great problems. [Laughter.] I proceed with the headlines: "Pennsylvanian says tariff lessons have been learned amid the noise of industrial activity." Merely a new paraphrase of the oft-repeated complacency with which the Republican party takes credit even for the beneficences of Providence.

But what I wish particularly to call to your attention in this eloquent speech of yesterday, to which you will presently listen, is the following from the peroration: "Incidental protection, a humbug and pretense, an insult to all reason and logic." I desire, in immediate contrast with this statement of the foremost champion of present-day Republican protectionism on this floor, to read from the first Republican national platform in which this subject was ever mentioned, that of 1860, what the doctrine of that party on the subject of protection was proclaimed to be before they had subordinated themselves to the instrumentalities that grew up in consequence of the abuses of it. I read from paragraph 12 of that platform:

That while providing revenue for the support of the General Government by duties upon imports, sound policy requires such an adjustment of these imports as to encourage the development of the industrial interests of the whole country.

Incidental protection was never better defined than in that very statement of it; and, sir, it illustrates the extent to which the Republican party has departed from its early faith, when one of the most brilliant exponents and defenders, one of the most honored champions, of the present-day creed of that organization now declares the original statement of the party belief on that subject to be a humbug and pretense, an insult to all reason and logic. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Why, Mr. Chairman, this recalcitrancy of the Republican party has extended to every single thing that it ever stood for. We have already seen how it abandoned its position on bimetallism in 1896 and subsequently; and I have just exhibited how its original doctrine on the tariff question, that of incidental protection, has grown into the huge practice of protection for protection's sake. It was the early boast of the Republican party that it had met a great exigency in the national life by the invention of the greenback, whereby the very existence of the Government was preserved. But the party long since turned its back upon the conception of Government money, as it has done upon every other one of its original tenets, and is to-day the advocate of the banker's system of finance pure and simple. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Upon the subject of reciprocity there has been a similar change of base. The great apostle of modern-day Republicanism, the late lamented President McKinley, in the last speech that ever fell from his lips, said at Buffalo, September 5, 1901:

*The period of exclusiveness has passed. The expansion of our trade and commerce is our present problem. * * * Reciprocity treaties are in harmony with the spirit of the times; measures of retaliation are not. If, perchance, some of our tariffs are no longer needed for revenue, or to encourage and protect our industries at home, why should they not be employed to expand and promote our markets abroad?*

This policy, thus advocated by McKinley, indorsed by the present Chief Executive time and again; ratified by the solemn pronouncements of several Republican national conventions, is

to-day repudiated and flouted by the leadership of a party apparently as deaf to the appeals of the people as it is unmindful of the solemn pledges of its conventions.

These changes of position by the Republican party on specific questions are only indicative of the altered spirit that controls the organization. The party that was born in a great outburst of national devotion to the rights of man and the cause of human liberty, whose earliest platforms were full of the Declaration of Independence and the spirit of 1776, has become the champion of a policy that negatives these original American principles. Nothing could be more opposed to the doctrine which inspired the revolution of our fathers against the colonial system of Great Britain than the new policy of the Republican party, which has burdened our democratical institutions with dependencies and colonies and brought millions of men beneath our power who are excluded from the exercise of our liberties.

On every side we witness indications of the complete domination of the Republican party by special privilege which, in return for opportunities of preying upon the people, pours into the coffers of that organization campaign funds of colossal proportions which are used for the perpetuation of this partnership between interests and politics by the most skillful organization known to the history of free government.

Sir, I listened yesterday with much interest to that long array of phenomena cited by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] in his endeavor to show that the only prosperity this country has ever enjoyed was under Republican tariff legislation, and in consequence of this legislation, and that the only disasters that have ever come upon the country have happened under Democratic tariff laws, and in consequence thereof. He did, indeed, under compulsion, somewhat modify this last statement, alleging that in certain cases the disaster had anticipated its cause and had been produced by the general fear that it would happen. Now, sir, we are all familiar with this old, old story. I greatly enjoyed the gentleman's recitation of the many splendid things that to-day exemplify the prosperity and glory of the United States of America and its people. I will not allow that gentleman, or any other gentleman, to go beyond me in paying tribute to the unequalled capacities of the American citizen or to the magnificent productivity and wealth in soil and mine and forest and climate of that splendid habitat wherein it has pleased God to plant this people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

He can be no more proud than I am of that impressive catalogue of national wealth, national prestige, and national achievement. But, sir, I am one of those who believe that the chief factors in the production of this unprecedented result are not the tariff schedules of the Republican party, but rather those causes, some of which I have cited, that have never before met in such number and measure in the conditions of any other civilization the world ever saw. We have a territory of greater contiguous extent for purposes of habitation and cultivation, subject to one system of laws and to freedom of exchange among more people of homogeneous circumstances, than history has ever known before. [Applause.] We have a citizenship whose conjoined talents and capacities represent the best development of the most enterprising races on the earth. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have time in which to conclude his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York have time to conclude his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. [Applause.]

Mr. TOWNE. I thank the committee. In addition, sir, to these unequalled sources of natural wealth, and to this unprecedented capacity upon the part of the inhabitants of such a country to develop and make use of these resources, we have in a system of laws, our Constitution and institutions of government that liberate to the fullest possible extent the genius, the physical and mental power of the individual, a factor perhaps greater than any of the others enumerated. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Those things it ought to be the chief glory of every American citizen to recognize and glorify as the foundation of the splendid prosperity of his country. It shows a poor conception of those great characteristic and fundamental principles to attempt to narrow into the slender margin of a tariff schedule the cause and explanation of these immeasurable results. But it has long been the fashion of Republican orators to recite pages of statistical opulence and chapters of frenzied rhetoric in rhapsodic praise of the Republican party. They have not deemed it necessary to show causal connection between premise and conclusion. It has seemed to them enough to say: "This is the greatest country on earth! We are richer

and more powerful than anybody! Hurrah for the Grand Old Party!"

By dint of constant reiteration these glib and tumid assertions are by and by accepted for sober fact. After a while their very age makes them venerable, respectable, authoritative. They become, indeed, hereditary. They are a kind of rhetorical covenant that runs with the party faith. Many a man upon the other side of this Chamber who is to-day a great Republican orator peddles these things merely because his father peddled them. He believed them originally on account of their honorable tradition, and, never having examined them since, he believes them now. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.] But of course they never were true, and they are not true now. It is indeed inexplicable that when the refutation of these assertions lies so ready to the hand of any honest inquirer there should endure such hardihood of repetition. Suppose, for example, you take the accepted statistics published by this Government, covering the decade between 1850 and 1860, when the country was under the operation of the Democratic tariff of 1846. You will find by the records that in population in wealth, in manufactures, in farm values, in railroad mileage, and, indeed, in every other particular commonly relied upon as statistical evidence of national wealth and progress, there was a much greater percentage of increase than in respect to the same items during any other ten years of the history of this nation. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If that statement is not true some gentleman following me in this debate can easily correct it. I am not now, let me caution the House, engaged in any careful effort to build up a statistical reply to this smug and complacent Republican doctrine of tariff-made prosperity, although it would be easy to become tedious with figures carrying such a lesson, but I am merely concerned to show in passing that this huge Republican assumption of universal prosperity under Republican rule and universal disaster under Democratic rule is an absurd and silly humbug, unsupported by the facts. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] says that there are problems of prosperity and problems of adversity; that we have problems from Republican prosperity and problems from Democratic adversity. That our adversity problems are due to the Democratic party I deny, and I have briefly indicated the folly of that contention. That we have problems, and serious problems, due to prosperity, and prosperity coincident oftentimes with Republican administration, I admit; I admit that those problems have recently increased in number and in portent, and I go further and charge that up to this hour the Republican party has displayed neither disposition nor capacity to solve those problems. The gentleman will, I think, find that he has used an almost fatally suggestive phrase when he coined his expression for Democratic arraignment on the stump in Indiana in the coming campaign. "Sweet are the uses of adversity," the great bard has said; and that illustrious man, the first Republican, Abraham Lincoln, declared that the people of the United States know the tendency of prosperity to breed tyrants. Yes, the problems of prosperity, my friends, are indeed the problems of this hour. They are the most difficult, the most devious, the most elusive, the most dangerous problems that any people in the world can face. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It has been said of the individual that prosperity is a greater moral test than adversity. Many a man gets along very well under narrow and unpropitious circumstances, compelled, by the very necessity of labor, to keep from indulging in errant ways the superabundant elasticity of his mind and body. But the man who is rich and does not need to worry is the man who is in danger from the lurking devil of temptation. [Applause.] And it is likewise with nations and civilizations. One absolute story has been written since the beginning of time. It was not foreign conquest that overwhelmed the states of ancient Greece; it was not external barbaric strength that crushed the Roman Empire like an egg shell. It was the dry rot of social and political corruption that destroyed the glory of Athens. It was the same inevitable disease that undermined the world-wide power of Rome. [Applause.] So long, sir, as the eagles of that imperial Republic, in their triumphant march northward to the German forests, southward to the sands of Africa, eastward beyond the Euphrates, and westward to the coast of Britain, were borne by men who were free the legions were invincible. It was only when her standards were feebly clasped in the nerveless hands of mercenary troops and industrial slaves that Rome tottered before the on-rush from the fastnesses of the North. [Applause.]

Sir, the people of the United States when but three millions strong, scattered along the fringe of the Atlantic coast, were able to vindicate their right to liberty and self-government

against the most powerful nation the world had ever seen ranged in war. Afterward, in the most awful fratricidal conflict ever necessitated by the evolution of any civilization, two sections of our common country fought out the survival of the idea of nationality in a struggle never surpassed in heroism and courage. As long as we remain politically free, industrially just, and socially pure we shall continue to be as secure against any assault from without, even by the leagued powers of the world, as we have been heretofore, against all enemies in the field. [Applause.] And if, which God forefend, the time should ever come that the standard of the Republic, full high advanced, should find itself no longer sustained by the hand of a freeman, but quivering in the uncertain grasp of an industrial serf and about to fall into the dust degraded, dishonored, and irrecoverable, it would be because the people of the United States had met these crucial problems of prosperity and, like every preceding civilization, had not been able to solve them. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But these abandonments of ancient doctrines by the Republican party, to which I have called attention, exhibit nothing wonderful or exceptional. It is the most natural thing in the world that any political party in control of the institutions of any free people should ultimately come to represent and obey the dominant economic influences of the time. It is always the instinct and policy of the interests at any given moment imparting direction to the economic progress of a people to control the laws by which industrial conditions are modified. This inevitably leads to an attempt, usually successful, to dominate the political organization which for the time being is in command of the machinery of the Government. It is a phenomenon repeated over and over again in the history of free governments. A party, in consequence of some great spasm of public virtue, some splendid sentiment of reform, comes into power representing at the moment the best impulses and highest purposes of the people; but, like Thackeray's maiden who went on cutting bread and butter, the people, after such self-assertion, are apt to return to their daily occupations. Having saved the country they think their duty is done. But the truth is that the country is never so much in danger as just after it has been saved; for then the selfish interests of society, always vigilant, take advantage of the inattention of the people to get into their own hands the strings that control the operation of the Government.

Thus, by a natural and almost inappreciable process, a party which comes into power as a radical party remains in power as a conservative party. It becomes "subdued to what it works in, like the dyer's hand." The party is then maintained in power, chiefly by two forces: First, the subtle management, the powerful business influences, and the limitless corrupt resources of the representatives of the interests that have secured control of the organization; and, secondly, by the amiable folly of those honest and well-meaning citizens who vote for a present wrong under the inspiration of the memory of an ancient glory. This process of transition from radicalism to conservatism never had a better illustration than the history of the Republican party. Hundreds of thousands of its voters to-day sincerely think that they are honoring the memory of Abraham Lincoln by voting the dictates of corrupt and grasping monopoly. And, sir, the people of this country are coming to realize that the economic forces of this era are solidifying and extending their power at the expense of the general welfare, by means of either the warrant or the permission of inequitable laws, and are masters of, and partners with, the leadership of the Republican party. [Applause.]

One of the results of this realization is a demand for a revision of the tariff that is finding a growing and widening expression in all sections of this country. The gentleman from Indiana who has spoken, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] who will speak, together with all the Republican apologists for the so-called stand-pat programme, declare that there is no such demand. Sir, they are compelled so to declare in order to justify themselves in making no effort to correct the evils complained of. They find themselves under the necessity of ignoring this popular outcry, even though it should be so loud as to split their ears. Those of us not under the same necessity of self-stultification as they are know full well the extent and nature of this dissatisfaction. Indeed, if a private inquest of judgment could be had, I should willingly leave the question of its existence to the knowledge of the average member of either side of this Chamber. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Why doth she protest so much? [Applause on the Democratic side.] The gentleman from Indiana says that the country knows the situation better than "the other side of this Chamber," and, standing on this side, I give him back his words and say that I, too, believe that the

country does understand the situation better than the "other side" of this Chamber. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Why, sir, it is not possible that those gentlemen have not heard from New England. To be sure, the eloquent gentleman admits that they are "whining about it" in Massachusetts; but he will find, if I am not very much mistaken, that the elaborate formulation of objections to the iniquities of the present tariff as applied to the interests of New England, which has been repeatedly made by some of the strongest and ablest men of that old Commonwealth, will eventuate in some exhibition vastly more interesting to the Republican party than "whining." [Applause on the Democratic side.] If [turning toward Mr. LANDIS] you will be, as you say, satisfied to read upon the stump in Indiana the quotation you cited yesterday from a speech by the distinguished leader of this side of the House, we shall be very glad to give you a Roland for your Oliver, and tell the people of Massachusetts how contemptuously the leadership of your party refers to their dignified and earnest protest. Aye, and we shall be in Indiana, too, hundreds of us, not fearing to tell the people of your State that the issue is between monopoly and justice.

Have the gentlemen on the other side of the House heard from Minnesota? Have they heard from Iowa? [Applause.] The only theory upon which I can comprehend their apparent belief that the Republicans are all right in Iowa is that they hope to succeed in driving Cummins into the Democratic party. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Keep on; and after you get rid of all the Republicans who want tariff revision, you may be calm and serene in Iowa, but you will find yourselves almighty in the minority. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You show little evidences, moreover, that you know of the existence of a Reciprocity League in this country; but I warn you that that league is a very lively proposition. They are issuing a great quantity of literature that is proving "mighty interesting reading" to the people of this country. One of the principal officers in that virile and purposeful organization, ex-United States Senator Harris, is a candidate on the Democratic ticket for governor of Kansas, and indications are that the Republican stand-patters in that State are in a condition bordering on panic. I do not think, my Republican friends, it is necessary at this moment to ask whether or not there is a large sentiment in the country for tariff revision. You may deny it; I affirm it. Nobody in the world will ever know exactly how much of it there is until it expresses itself at the polls, and for that verdict we, on this side, are quite content to wait. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman from Indiana says that as to the problems of adversity, whose heavy responsibility he charges upon the Democratic party, the evidence was furnished by that party between 1893 and 1897. This, of course, is the familiar refrain that is always introduced into Republican performances on this subject. I do not like to refer to this statement as a calumny, for that would imply that it is a conscious affirmation of what is not true, and I wish to be not only parliamentary but perfectly respectful and gentlemanly in this argument. I entertain no particle of malice against a single man on the other side of this Chamber. Many of them are my personal friends. Of a great number of them I entertain the highest opinion. I listened to the speech of the gentleman from Indiana yesterday, as a friend, with the greatest admiration. He possesses both the physical qualifications of an effective parliamentary orator and the mental equipment also; but he reminded me, to use a simile of ancient and honorable lineage, of a strong man in a morass, for the harder he struggled the deeper he sank in the mazes of his own confusion.

The Republican campaign text-book, pursuing the same course as the gentleman from Indiana, confines its citation of evidence against the Democratic party to the period between 1893 and 1897. Why? Because Cleveland came in on March 4, 1893, and they did not care to include any evidence of "adversity" before that date and under the preceding Republican administration. Now, I propose to supply to some extent this interesting deficiency.

The McKinley law became effective on the 9th of October, 1890. Here are some facts of record in the commercial history of that period. On November 11, one month and two days after the McKinley law went into effect, the New York Clearing House Association voted its certificates to banks in its association, admitted to be in dire distress. Six days later, November 17, 1890, the Boston clearing house did the same thing. On the same day the great banking house of Barker Brothers in Philadelphia failed for \$5,000,000. In the same city, two days thereafter, there was a run on the Citizens' Savings Bank, and a receiver was appointed for the North River Bank. On Novem-

ber 22, 1890, the United Rolling Stock Company of Chicago made an assignment for \$6,851,000.

This, remember, was late in the fall of 1890, the month following the enactment of the McKinley law, when, according to Republican contention on this floor yesterday, the farmers of Kansas were getting rich selling their corn, and when there was universal prosperity, because the McKinley bill was in operation and nobody was yet afraid of the Wilson bill, which was some four years in the future. On November 28, 1890, B. J. Jamison & Co., of Philadelphia, failed for two millions. On December 6 the Oliver Iron and Steel Mills, of Pittsburg, closed down, throwing 2,000 workmen out of employment. On the same day Myer & Co., of New Orleans, failed with liabilities of two millions. On January 3, 1891, the Scottsdale Rolling Mills and Pipe Works and the Charlotte Furnace and Coke Company, of Philadelphia, went to the wall, throwing out 10,000 workmen. On the 18th of January, 1891, the American National Bank, of Kansas City, shut its doors, with liabilities of two and a quarter millions of dollars. On the 8th of May, 1891, the Spring Garden National Bank and the Pennsylvania Safe Deposit and Trust Company, of Philadelphia, closed their doors. In 1892, in the fall before the elections, there occurred in the State of Pennsylvania the Homestead strike, which wrote one of the most awful chapters in the industrial experience of the world. The facts I have mentioned are merely illustrative. They by no means constitute a complete catalogue of their kind. Thousands of similar histories were written in those dark days. Cleveland came into office on the 4th of March, 1893, and when, under the impulse already attained, there had been two considerable failures, those of S. E. White & Co., of New York, and the Commercial Bank, of Chicago, and its branches, there began in May, 1893, those raids upon the national banks which added to the industrial calamity experienced from 1890 to 1893 under the Republican tariff law by creating a monetary panic due to a conspiracy among the bankers to force the repeal of the Sherman silver-purchase law. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. McCLEARY. Will it interrupt my friend for me to ask him a question?

Mr. TOWNE. Not seriously.

Mr. McCLEARY. My question is this: My friend has cited certain things that happened, and he is too honorable a man to assert what is not true, and therefore I shall not attempt to deny the facts; but I want to ask him this question: Those all occurred in the winter of 1890 and 1891, did they not?

Mr. TOWNE. Oh, no; the gentleman should make his premise right.

Mr. McCLEARY. You say the bill was passed in October, 1890?

Mr. TOWNE. Yes; and the first calamity date is November 11, 1890, and the last I cited is in May, 1893.

Mr. McCLEARY. I am taking now the ones you first gave.

Mr. TOWNE. Select them at your convenience.

Mr. McCLEARY. I am taking the initiation of this matter. Can my friend tell me what was the result of the election of 1890 in this House?

Mr. TOWNE. The gentleman remembers it very well; what was it?

Mr. McCLEARY. About three-fourths of these seats were occupied by Democrats. Let me ask another question: Does my friend know one exception in the history of our country, when the mid-term election did not forecast the coming Presidential election?

Mr. TOWNE. The gentleman may extract any comfort he may find in his formula. I am perfectly willing to allow final judgment to await the election of the Members of the Sixtieth Congress. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. McCLEARY. We accept the gage of battle.

Mr. TOWNE. That is right; I want to see a clean-cut fight.

Mr. McCLEARY. You will get one.

Mr. GRAHAM. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. TOWNE. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will just call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the strike at Homestead was not caused by any industrial depression in the country, but it occurred through the recognition, or the attempted recognition, of the Amalgamated Association. Industrial conditions had nothing whatever to do with that great strike.

Mr. TOWNE. I suppose, sir, that the gentleman indorses the proposition that used to be made during the silver debates by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FOWLER], chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, who held, if I remember correctly, that strikes and lockouts are evidences of universal prosperity.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. TOWNE. Certainly.

Mr. FOWLER. Did we have very many of them in 1893 and 1894 when there was nothing to divide?

Mr. TOWNE. Oh, we may not have had so many, but a few will do when they are big enough.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I may resume, there are two or three further matters in this connection to which I desire to refer, but before doing so I wish to call the attention of my former colleague from Minnesota, who interrupted me shortly ago, to the fact that he is very welcome to any result he may be able to deduce from the point he attempted to make with regard to the dates of the various occurrences to which I have referred. My immediate purpose was to show by citation of individual facts having their location in every section of this country and in every important city, that the threadbare and customary allegation of calamity as universally characteristic of Democratic rule, and of prosperity, as always attendant upon Republican ascendancy, is absolutely without foundation. I desire to give the *coup de grace* to this foolish and silly pretense.

The Republican party returned to power on the 4th of March, 1889. In the eloquent speech of the gentleman from Indiana yesterday, referring to the alleged business incapacity of the Democratic party and of Democrats individually, he instanced, if I remember correctly, the state of the Treasury during the Democratic administration of Mr. Cleveland. In that connection let me refer the gentleman to a few facts, and I hope the gentlemen who are to follow me in this debate may take time to wrestle with these facts. When Mr. Harrison took office in March, 1889, there was a surplus in the national treasury of \$330,384,916.09, left over by the Democratic administration, which had also paid off more than one-third of a billion of dollars of the national obligations. Now, when Mr. Cleveland came in the second time, after the administration of Harrison and after the enactment of the McKinley law, that surplus had disappeared, and appropriations had already been made exceeding the revenues of the Government by \$90,000,000 by the end of the first fiscal year. The enormous surplus had disappeared, a tremendous deficit was in sight, and the Treasury was seriously embarrassed. Indeed, as ex-Secretary Foster has confessed, the plates were already prepared for the issuance of bonds by the national Republican Administration with which to meet this deficit.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I presume the gentleman does not wish to misrepresent a dead man?

Mr. TOWNE. Neither a dead man nor a living one.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Over and again, and within the last Congress, the written statement of ex-Secretary Foster has been filed here, stating that no engraving was ever made, and the further statement that at the close of his term there was \$103,000,000 surplus in the Treasury.

Mr. TOWNE. Why, the official figures show what was left.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. TOWNE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I have read the order that Secretary Charles Foster signed, and it was then, February 25, 1893, on file in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, under the Treasury Department.

Mr. BARTLETT. I have a copy of it here. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Now, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield—

Mr. TOWNE. I shall be glad to yield if for any good purpose.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman has ample time.

Mr. TOWNE. What is the wish of the gentleman?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I rise for a good purpose. The order signed by Mr. Foster was at the request of the incoming Secretary [cries of "Oh!" on the Democratic side], Mr. Carlisle. He ordered the execution of the plates for the purpose of engraving Treasury certificates. Mr. Cleveland forbade that that be done and the order was withdrawn, no work of the kind was ever attempted, and that was the end of the transaction. The gentleman has stated that the order was made and I thought it was proper to call his attention to what was really done.

Mr. TOWNE. I am very glad that the gentleman admits the substance of my charge.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield for just one statement?

Mr. TOWNE. Let us hear it.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Cleveland, in a published article, stated that just before his incoming second Administration the Republican Administration negotiated the exchange of greenbacks

with the banks for gold temporarily in order to tide over and leave some gold in the Treasury, otherwise that there would have been none there. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. The amount, I believe, was \$6,500,000.

Mr. TOWNE. If the chair pleases, I am not so much concerned at this moment in determining this question with literal accuracy. I made the charge upon apparently good authority; and now, through the kindness of my distinguished and ever-vigilant friend, the gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. BARTLETT], I am able to produce a copy of the original order to which I have referred. I understand there is no question as to its authenticity, but if there is, it may easily be inquired into further in this debate. Here is the order:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., February 20, 1895.

Sir: You are hereby authorized and directed to prepare designs for the 3 per cent bonds provided in a Senate amendment to the sundry civil bill now pending. The denominations which should first receive attention are \$100 and \$1,000 of the coupon bonds and \$100, \$1,000, and \$10,000 of the registered bonds.

This authority is given in advance of the enactment, in view of pressing contingencies, and you are directed to hasten the preparation of the designs and plates in every possible manner.

I inclose a memorandum for your guidance in preparing the script for the body of the bond.

Respectfully, yours,

CHARLES FOSTER,
Secretary.

To the CHIEF OF THE BUREAU OF ENGRAVING AND PRINTING.

Will the gentleman from Ohio deny the authenticity of that letter?

Mr. GROSVENOR. No; it has been printed in—

Mr. TOWNE (interrupting). Does the gentleman deny the authenticity of the letter?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Why, certainly not; it has been read and printed in our RECORD a score of times, but it never went beyond that order and was withdrawn at the request of Mr. Carlisle himself.

Mr. TOWNE. I decline to yield further. There is no use in fighting when the foe is down. The point of the desperate extremity of the Harrison Administration is established, and not only that, but admitted, and it would be true if it were not admitted. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

There is great satisfaction, sir, in the fact that the discussion of the tariff question which is now going on in this country has caused to emerge clearly into the open two admissions which absolutely must convict the Republican party in the judgment of the American people of legislative iniquities calling for the most condign punishment. It is abundantly clear that the exaggerated tariff schedules are responsible for a very considerable percentage of the monopoly and trust abuses of which the people complain. That these tariff barriers are unreasonably high, and that behind them are sheltered combinations which, without any fear from foreign competition, are enabled to regulate their own rapacity only by their judgment of how much can be wrung from the victims of the process, will not be seriously disputed.

Indeed, the entire admission is implicit in the now frankly acknowledged fact that tariff-protected manufacturers customarily sell in foreign markets at prices very greatly beneath those which are charged to the American consumer for the same products. The overwhelming evidence on this point which has been produced before the country, a great part of which will be found in the admirable speeches on the subject in the House by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINES] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], has completely destroyed all attempt at denial and has finally forced the advocates of the system to come out openly in its defense. The debate on the subject has been most interesting. Early in its course there appeared that veteran knight of parliamentary joust and tourney, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], the scarred, grizzled, and undaunted champion of many a forlorn-hope assault upon the fortresses of uncomfortable fact. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] He denied the existence of this custom of underselling, but when he clamored rhetorically for the proof of it, the proof was furnished him until he fairly choked on it. Next came the debonaire gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL], who vainly endeavored to lose the point in studied bucolic reminiscences and literary speculation. [Laughter and applause.]

When the gentleman from Washington [Mr. CUSHMAN] came forth into the lists in support of every Republican thing in sight, he chose to ignore this particular proposition and to disport himself among the more congenial if not more relevant and seemingly topics of boarding-house blasphemy and the wit of the hustings. But the time came when the matter had to be taken seriously; and so, finally, the distinguished Athenian from Ohio

[Mr. GROSVENOR] and the fearless orator from the Wabash [Mr. LANDIS] on yesterday, joining the theretofore lonely but intrepid Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Shaw, admitted the accusation, admitted it indeed somewhat boastfully, claiming, by a tortuous logic characteristic of their peculiar mental processes, to find in it one of the main supports, merits, and beneficences of the too-high-protection system. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

So, sir, it now appears beyond all controversy, through formal and record stipulation by responsible representatives of the Republican party, that it is the habit of the protected manufacturers of America to sell their products abroad at lower prices, and at very considerably lower prices, than those at which they sell the same products in American markets. [Applause on the Democratic side.] "Why," says the gentleman from Indiana, "yes, of course they sell abroad cheaper than they do at home. Why, that is business; and if you fellows over on the other side," meaning us Democrats, "knew anything about business you would know it was so." This procedure, the gentleman declares, is merely good ordinary business sense. My friends, undoubtedly it is "business;" and let me remind the country that nothing better illustrates the extent to which the Republican party is subordinated to the selfish interests of to-day than its instant readiness, at the dictation of its business owners, to put the label of "business" upon every political faith it professes. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Oh, yes, it is undoubtedly "business" for the manufacturers; but in God's name what kind of "business" is it for the American people? [Applause on the Democratic side.] Let me say to the gentleman from Indiana that on this side of the chamber we may not know "business" in the accepted Republican sense very thoroughly, but I believe we do know the people of the United States, and that they will recognize that in that kind of business their welfare has been neglected and betrayed. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman cites the case of a hot-water heating plant, if I remember correctly, made up in Iowa, and furnished at the price of \$125, which the manufacturer told Mr. LANDIS he would be willing to duplicate for Mr. LANDIS's home in Indiana for \$100; and the gentleman from Indiana adds that the man who was paying \$125 for his plant stood by and heard the \$100 proposition. Not only that, but he is said to have applauded it. He was delighted, said the gentleman from Indiana, to pay \$125 for his plant and to let Mr. LANDIS pay \$100 for one precisely like it, because that procedure would start the Iowa heating-plant man's business down in Indiana. I do not doubt that such an isolated instance occurred; but I venture the statement that if the man engaged in manufacturing hot-water heating plants in an Iowa village should undertake to make a business of charging his neighbors 25 per cent more than he charged his customers in Indiana, he would come to a very sudden realization that their satisfaction with the process was short-lived. Let it not be forgotten that in this very grave matter we are not dealing with an isolated sale for the purpose of getting entrance to a foreign market, but with a constant, regular business custom, which is admitted, avowed, advocated, and eulogized. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

And I say to you, gentlemen on the Republican side of this House, all we want in this campaign is that you shall be as frank on every stump as Mr. LANDIS says he will be in Indiana. Go out before the country and admit that the custom among your protected manufacturers, who do not need the degree of protection they are receiving, and in whom that excessive protection incites the practice of monopoly, to sell at much lower prices abroad than at home, and the electors of this country in the coming Congressional campaign will visit upon your heads a reprobation that you will not forget until you shall have lost the Presidential campaign of 1908. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Sir, my friend from Indiana, a most eloquent and interesting speaker, indulged himself in another panegyric on this lauded "business" custom, in a long series of rhythmic periodicity which, if not very convincing as an argument, was decidedly effective as rhetoric. He permitted himself to grow enthusiastic and eloquent over the fact that the great railroad train which runs from Moscow to Manchuria, across the vast plains, through the mountains, and over the steppes of the Russian Empire, is hauled by a locomotive manufactured in America.

"Was it bought cheaper than it could have been bought at home?" He exclaims (I quote him from memory):

I know not, and I do not care. It is enough for me to know that that locomotive was made in the United States of America and carries the fame of the enterprise of my country beyond the confines of Asia.

He then described that other locomotive which hauls, at 60

miles an hour, the famous flyer from Tokio across Japan. That, too, it seems, was made in America. Again he exclaims:

Was it bought cheaper abroad than it could have been bought at home? I do not know, and I do not care. It is enough for me to know that it was made in America, etc., etc., etc.

The gentleman, indeed, was so far gone in his rhapsody that, with magnificent optimism, as he gazed at the stars and clenched his fist, he declared that it was enough for him to know that even if the manufacturers had given their locomotives and machines away the operation had opened a market in foreign countries for American goods. Now, Mr. Chairman, I will not permit my friend from Indiana to exceed me in the admiration he justly pays to the ingenuity, the enterprise, the commercial fortitude, and ability that have won so many triumphs for American genius in contributing to the development of the prosperity of less happy men in other parts of the world.

But I say that these conquests of American skill are possible consistently with the preservation of the interests of our own people; and let me tell the gentleman that if once the citizens of this country grasp the fact in a realizing sense that the foreigner who purchases a locomotive at a cheaper price than the American can buy it for, is enabled to do so only at the cost to the American consumer of higher rates on American railroads, so that the difference between the prices charged at home and those charged abroad comes out of the pockets of the patrons of our railroads, there will follow so signal an exhibition of the common sense of the average American citizen as will thoroughly vindicate our right to self-government. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Republican orators express great concern for the workingman. Perhaps the most lurid passages in the speech of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] on yesterday were devoted to this subject. There is no doubt that in times past a great element in the success of the Republican party has been its ability to make laboring men believe that they owe their employment to that organization. But I warn the gentleman that the old arguments need reinforcement. The men of toll are coming to be at least as well informed on practical political economy as any other class of our citizenship. They are contrasting the Republican claim that ultraprotection against foreign commodities is mainly in their interest with the Republican practice of admitting the nearly unrestricted competition of foreign labor. They have not failed to note that, while the Republican party has made certain that the machinery for the construction of the Panama Canal shall be bought in the dearest market, the labor employed there shall be got in the cheapest market and be also denied the protection of the eight-hour law. They are quite aware that Republican policies are largely responsible for the artificially high prices of many things they consume, while a considerable percentage of the high wages Republicans take credit for is due to the efficiency of the organization of labor.

The gentleman from Indiana will find that his generalities will little avail to answer the demands that aroused and intelligent labor is now making of his party. I commend to his prayerful consideration the formal arraignment of the Republican organization by the representatives of labor made in the document laid before the President, the President pro tempore of the Senate, and the Speaker of this House, on March 21 last, wherein:

First. They complain that the eight-hour law is grievously and frequently violated; that since 1894 they have vainly sought to secure legislation remedying the defects of that law and extending its provisions to all work done on behalf of the Government; that recently, without a hearing to the advocates of eight-hour legislation, a law was passed by Congress and signed by the President, as a rider on an appropriation bill, "nullifying the eight-hour law and principle in its application to the greatest public work ever undertaken by our Government—the construction of the Panama Canal."

Second. They complain that no heed has been paid to labor's request for legislation safeguarding it against the competition of convicts.

Third. They complain that no result has followed their demand for relief against the evils of "induced and undesirable immigration;" that the Chinese-exclusion law is being "flagrantly violated," and that it is now "seriously proposed to invalidate that law" and reverse our policy.

Fourth. They complain that equal rights are denied to seamen; that even the partial relief afforded them by the laws of 1895 and 1898 have been threatened at each succeeding Congress; that petitions in behalf of the seamen have been denied "and a disposition shown to extend to other workmen the system of compulsory labor," and that, "under the guise of a bill to subsidize the shipping industry, a provision is incorporated, and has already passed the Senate, providing for a form of conscription which would make compulsory naval service a condition precedent to employment on privately owned vessels."

Fifth. They complain that undermanning and unskilled manning of vessels are largely responsible for disasters like the burning of the *Slocum* in New York Harbor and the wreck of the *Rio de Janeiro* at San Francisco, with their terrible and unnecessary loss of human life, and that measures presented by them more in the interest of the public than of themselves, calculated to prevent such calamities, have not been adopted.

Sixth. They complain that they have vainly sought the passage of a

law prescribing that barges towed at sea shall be properly manned and equipped so as to avoid the loss of life now frequently involved in cutting them loose during storms and leaving the crews to perish.

Seventh. They complain that the "antitrust and interstate-commerce laws enacted to protect the people against monopoly in the products of labor, and against discrimination in the transportation thereof, have been perverted, so far as the laborers are concerned, so as to invade and violate their personal liberty as guaranteed by the Constitution," and that their repeated efforts to obtain redress from Congress have been in vain.

Eighth. They complain of the abuse of the "beneficent writ of injunction" in labor disputes, claiming that it has been perverted from the protection of property rights to the destruction of personal freedom, and that there is a threat of "statutory authority for existing judicial usurpation."

Ninth. They complain that the committees of this House having jurisdiction of matters particularly of interest to labor have been constituted inimically to it, and that requests to the Speaker to remedy this condition as apparent in the last two Congresses have been followed in the present Congress by even an accentuation of the condition.

Tenth. They complain that the constitutional right of petition has been invaded by the Executive order recently issued "forbidding any and all Government employees, upon pain of instant dismissal from the Government service, to petition Congress for any redress of grievances or for any improvement in their condition."

Mr. Chairman, it is abundantly clear that no revision of the tariff is to be undertaken by the Republican party. Every day's history of the present session of Congress has given confirmation to that report which found general currency when first we met here in December, that a compact had been entered into between the Speaker of this House and the President of the United States whereby the former was to be permitted to shelter the tariff monopolies on condition that the latter should be given free rein in attempting to carry out the Democratic policy of railroad rate regulation. The Speaker is to be congratulated upon the fact that the *modus vivendi* has thus far been observed and bids fair to outlast the session. In view of the fact that the President of the United States, in a speech at Logansport, Ind., as long ago as 1902, promised the appointment of a tariff commission to study methods for revising the schedules, and of the fact that there has been a general belief in the country that the President was in favor of a readjustment of many of the tariff duties; in view, also, of the fact that the railroad rate legislation had the right of way, and might easily, at the time the compact was made, have been expected to be finished and out of the way in time to leave a dangerous interval before adjournment; and in consideration of the further fact that such an understanding might readily have been vitiated in Executive contemplation by conditions subsequent; any candid student of the situation must admit that the distinguished Speaker of the House took a good many chances. Indeed, I myself should not be greatly surprised if even yet, in the last days of the session, there should come a thunderous bugle blast from the other end of the Avenue declaring that the tariff must and shall be reformed, and asking that a commission be named to sit on the subject during the recess, so that the people might be fooled until after the election of a Republican Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I have already spoken much longer than I had intended to speak, and I shall endeavor not to overtax the patience of the House, nor to do much further violence to the rights of those gentlemen who are to follow me in the debate. In the press reports of a speech which I had the honor to deliver in Kansas City not many weeks ago, it was stated that I intended to return to Washington to "expose" the President of the United States. That report did not properly state what I said, nor what I purposed to do. What I said was that it was not then within my contemplation to consider at any length certain acts of the Chief Executive to which I had briefly made reference, but that at some future time and in another place I expected to discuss them with more fullness. It is, I take it, well within the province of a member of this popular representative branch of the National Legislature to examine and, within the limits of the decencies and proprieties of parliamentary discussion, to criticize the official conduct of the President of the United States. The independence of the legislative branch of the Government and the responsibilities of the Executive Office justify and require this liberty of comment.

It is, in my deliberate opinion, a very serious matter, not only as related to pending and immediately prospective public questions, but as concerning the development of our institutions and the preservation of that wise balance of power among the coordinate branches of this Government to which so much importance was originally attached, that the present Chief Executive of the country is disposed to magnify and to personalize his great office and to exercise authority beyond not only the traditional but the legal and constitutional limitations of his place. [Applause from the Democratic side.] This is not the time or the occasion, sir, for anybody, and certainly not for one no more competent to the task than I can claim to be, to attempt anything like an analysis and final judgment upon the

character and achievements of Theodore Roosevelt, as to whom future historians, as has been the case with his contemporaries, will undoubtedly differ radically among themselves. There will be panegyrists and detractors hereafter, as there are eulogists and faultfinders now. I shall attempt no ultimate judgment. I shall briefly, however, comment upon certain aspects of his character, and upon certain of his official performances, for the purpose of drawing what seems to me to be necessary and helpful conclusions. There are many things in the character and endowments of that remarkable man that I have admired. There are also, on the other hand, many things that, as a representative of the people in this great body, I feel justified in pronouncing to be of a nature to unfit him for a judicious, careful, just, and deliberate discharge of high executive functions, and under the impulsion of which he has time and again gone beyond the legitimate boundaries of his authority. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

This tendency of the Chief Executive is a matter of common knowledge among members of both Houses of Congress and the representatives of the newspaper press who are stationed at the capital. It is a serious misfortune, as I view it, that the unusual vogue enjoyed by the President imposes upon Senators, Representatives, and correspondents a reticence in regard to these excesses of Executive authority that would not under ordinary conditions be observed. In my opinion we ought to be honest with the people of the United States, and tell them frankly what everybody in this House knows, what every member of the Senate knows, and what everybody in the press galleries knows, that the President of the United States endeavors, so far as an almost phenomenal activity and endurance will permit, to embrace within himself and to exercise at once almost all of the powers and prerogatives of the three coordinate branches of this Government. Moreover, he seems to regard the high and solemn duties of his office not only as in the nature of personal assets of his own, but as appropriate occasion for the exercise of an indeliberate and whimsical disposition apparently as little regardful of the momentousness and significance of his action as that of a boy occupied with his toys.

The reorganization of the Army has emphasized the military aspects of the Presidency. The President's relation to the Army is not much different from that sustained by the Emperor William to the German army. It is notorious that promotions during the present administration have been made in a manner so harmful to the discipline of the service, and to so great a degree upon grounds of favoritism and personal preference, as to have become the subject of repeated and solicitous conference among men having knowledge of the situation and concerned with the preservation of the *morale* of the Army. The diplomatic service has fallen under the same influence. The Secretary of State, although himself a man of great ability and strong personality, has had many of his functions shorn. The President's relation to the general body of the service is much more intimate and direct than heretofore, and we have recently seen how, for the first time in American diplomacy, the President has referred to a high representative of the United States at a foreign court as "my ambassador." A similar personal dominance is asserted in the province of every Cabinet office, and everybody remembers the promulgation of the famous "order of silence" by which those high functionaries were forbidden to talk to reporters about their business, and directed to leave a monopoly of publicity to the head of the Government.

The civil-service rules have been made conveniently pliant to the personal and political exigencies of the Chief Executive, and, although in former days that gentleman filled a great place in the movement for civil-service reform, the records show that the rules have been set aside during his administration about four times as often as they were during his predecessor's term. The most important considerations of public policy are constantly and customarily made subservient to the personal feelings of the Chief Magistrate. The evidence, for example, to which everybody had access, disclosed that one of his Cabinet officers, some time since resigned, had been engaged, while occupying a high official position with a great railroad system, in repeated violations of the interstate-commerce law; but the fact of his close official and personal relation to the President not only relieved him from prosecution or censure, but actually won for him an official certificate of innocence in direct contradiction of even his own confession.

The famous investigation of the Post-Office Department was delayed, and the information upon which it subsequently proceeded was pronounced by a member of the Cabinet to be "hot air," after complete evidence of the evils in that Department had been lying on the desk of the President for many weeks. A post-office in a southern State was abolished by the President,

and patrons were compelled to go 30 miles to another office for their mail, because of Executive pique over the opposition of the community to the reception of a colored postmaster into so close a relation with the women and children of a community where custom and social feeling inevitably revolted at the arrangement. A favorite, who entered the service of the United States eight years ago from a medical practice, and who, as a result of successive promotions, which it has made the trained eye dizzy to follow, is already well advanced toward the headship of the Army, came from the Philippines for medical treatment in this country, and, upon Executive order, circumnavigated the globe on his return at an aggregate per diem expense of \$3,600 to the National Treasury.

In February, 1905, Admiral Walker testified that he and other members of the Panama Canal Commission, on the President's express authorization, charged and received, in addition to their regular compensation, director's fees for attending the meetings of the board of directors of the Panama Railroad. Expenses far beyond those that have scandalized former administrations are incurred by this administration with a gay and easy nonchalance seemingly justified by the entire lack of subsequent public criticism. Whereas wide and unfavorable comment was made upon one of his predecessors for too frequent use of one Government vessel, very little is now said about the employment by the President of the United States of the *Sylph*, the *Dolphin*, and the *Mayflower* together. White House repairs are undertaken and carried out apparently with as little hesitancy as that with which a prosperous farmer would build a wood shed; and \$750,000 is spent in alleged increase of the facilities and attractions of the Executive Mansion, where no living architect can possibly see where there was opportunity to disburse more than a seventh of that sum to produce the very unhandsome results. Some of these matters to which I have referred thus cursorily may seem somewhat trivial. The catalogue is not exhaustive even of important considerations. I cite these few only as illustrative of that persistent and irrepressible tendency to personalize his office, to regard it as an appendage to his will, which characterizes the present occupant of that great place.

It is, moreover, inevitable that a man possessing the characteristics of the President should trench upon the traditional and constitutional restrictions of his authority. This natural inclination is unfortunately reinforced by certain considerations growing out of the political conditions of our time. In the first place, there is a necessary reaction upon the methods of our Executive Department by the unavoidable secrecy and arbitrariness with which the affairs of our colonial possessions are conducted. It is yet too soon for us fully to appreciate the irreparable damage done to our peculiar institutions by the rash assumption of the dangers of colonial government. From the commencement of this departure in our experience I have felt the deepest concern for its effect upon that constitutional balance among the different departments of the Government upon which our elder statesmen placed so much stress, and upon whose permanent preservation, as I believe, rests to a very large degree the perpetuity of civil liberty in this country. In the course of a speech on our Philippine policy in the Senate of the United States, on the 28th of January, 1901, I used the following language:

This policy favors the growth of the executive department of the Government at the expense of the others, and is opposed to democratic principles. It involves singleness of authority, celerity of action, secrecy of purpose, irresponsibility; all contrary to the necessary methods of self-government. It begets a superficial admiration for "strong government," and "simple government," which are absolutely inconsistent with liberty. Let me again quote words of wisdom from the speech of Daniel Webster, already cited:

"Nothing is more deceptive or more dangerous than the pretense of a desire to simplify government. The simplest governments are despotisms; the next simplest, limited monarchies; but all republics, all governments of law, must impose numerous limitations and qualifications of authority, and give many positive and many qualified rights. In other words, they must be subject to rule and regulation. This is the very essence of free political institutions.

"The spirit of liberty is, indeed, a bold and fearless spirit; but it is also a sharp-sighted spirit; it is a cautious, sagacious, discriminating, far-seeing intelligence; it is jealous of encroachment, jealous of power, jealous of man. It demands checks; it looks for guards; it insists on securities; it intrenches itself behind strong defenses, and fortifies itself with all possible care against the assaults of ambition and passion.

"It does not trust the amiable weaknesses of human nature, and, therefore, it will not permit power to overstep its prescribed limits, though benevolence, good intent, and patriotic purpose come along with it. Neither does it satisfy itself with flashy and temporary resistance to illegal authority. Far otherwise. It seeks for duration and permanence. It looks before and after; and, building on the experience of ages which are past, it labors diligently for the benefit of ages to come. This is the nature of constitutional liberty, and this is our liberty, if we will rightly understand and preserve it. Every free government is necessarily complicated, because all such governments establish restraints, as well on the power of government itself as on that of individuals.

A president can not be at one and the same time a constitutional chief magistrate and an autocrat—a President in America, with imperial powers in the Orient.

Sir, our fathers rightly distrusted the tendency toward excess on the part of the Executive authority. Their study of history had made them sensitive on this point. Its verdict is absolute as to the necessity of observing a balance of power among the respective depositaries of our delegated sovereignty. Seriously and permanently to disturb that balance is to enter upon the road to chaos.

The heavens themselves, the planets, and this center
Observe degree, priority, and place,
Insisture, course, proportion, season, form,
Office and custom, in all line of order:
And therefore is the glorious planet Sol
In noble eminence enthroned and sphered
Amidst the other; whose medicinal eye
Corrects the ill aspects of planets evil,
And posts, like the commandment of a king,
Sans check, to good and bad. But when the planets
In evil mixture to disorder wander,
What plagues and what portents, what mutiny,
What raging of the sea, shaking of earth,
Commotion in the winds, frights, changes, horrors,
Divert and crack, rend and deracinate
The unity and married calm of states
Quite from their fixture! O when degree is shaken,
Which is the ladder to all high designs,
The enterprise is sick! How could communities,
Degrees in schools, and brotherhoods in cities,
Peaceful commerce from dividable shores,
The primogenitive and due of birth,
Prerogative of age, crowns, sceptres, laurels,
But by degree, stand in authentic place?
Take but degree away, untune that string,
And, hark, what discord follows! each thing meets
In mere oppugnancy: the bounded waters
Should lift their bosoms higher than the shores,
And make a sop of all this solid globe;
Strength should be lord of imbecility,
And the rude son should strike his father dead;
Force should be right; or rather, right and wrong,
Between whose endless jar justice resides,
Should lose their names, and so should justice, too.
Then every thing includes itself in power,
Power into will, will into appetite;
And appetite, an universal wolf,
So doubly seconded with will and power,
Must make perforce an universal prey,
And last eat up himself.

There is no question in my mind, sir, that the reaction of our absolute government in our distant possessions is partly responsible for the tendency toward Executive excess, at which all close students of our institutions are now gravely concerned. But there is another consideration which reinforces the one just mentioned and the natural characteristics of the President. I refer to the phenomenal popular majority by which the present Chief Magistrate was chosen in the election of 1904. The country had full notice of the personality of the Republican candidate, and was told from every Democratic stump what would be the inevitable tendency of the expression of that personality if it should receive an emphatic electoral indorsement. The recipient of that indorsement can, in one sense, hardly be blamed if he considers the verdict so rendered with such emphasis and after definite notice, as in the nature of a license to exercise his predispositions to the utmost. The result has certainly justified the prognostications. It is only fair to say, however, that these actions since the election of 1904 have merely been of a piece with those that characterized the Presidency of the present incumbent in his first fractional term.

Without attempting a numerous recitation, to say nothing of an exhaustive one, of the matters that may readily be cited in illustration of the proposition I am now considering, I shall mention a few which are of common knowledge.

Everybody remembers the famous "pension order" whereby, while a bill was pending in Congress concerning a classification of claimants before the Pension Office, an Executive order, impatient of the delay by Congress, undertook to perform the function of a legislative act. There has been a practically constant interference from the White House with legislative procedure at the Capitol. It will be recalled how the Irrigation Bill was threatened with a veto unless it should contain certain provisions agreeable to the Executive. The great struggle over the Cuban tariff, the recent controversy about statehood for Indian Territory and Oklahoma and Arizona and New Mexico, and over the provisions of the Railroad Rate Bill are a few among many matters in regard to which the Executive initiative and constant participation in all the complications that attend the progress of a bill from its inception to its passage, might well raise a doubt whether there is any such thing now in our system of government as an independent responsible legislative branch.

The Senate of the United States, in regard to those semi-Executive functions vested in it by the Constitution, has been treated with similar masterfulness. Some fifteen months ago the Arbitration Treaties were withdrawn from the Senate by the President because that body insisted upon the use of the word "treaty" instead of "agreement," thus refusing to coun-

tenance the new view that there are certain permanent international compacts into which the President may enter on behalf of this country without the participation of the Senate. In the case of the Santo Domingo treaty an attempt was made by the President of the United States to make a treaty with a foreign government without the action of the Senate, which treaty, moreover, involved a new departure in our diplomacy and the adoption of what the President has called a "development" of the Monroe doctrine, potentially fraught with the most momentous consequences to this country.

It seems to me that this is a good connection in which to emphasize the fact that this new doctrine of the responsibility of the United States for the debts and defaults of the South American States, involving on our part the assumption of the duties of constable for the nations of Europe, ought, whatever its merits or demerits, to stand upon its own pretensions and not be permitted to shelter itself behind the designation of "Monroe doctrine."

The Monroe doctrine, properly so called, is a part of the settled policy of this Government, and is very dear to the people of this country. A novel proposition may frequently find acceptance through its success in borrowing the label of one already generally entertained. Whether this new international theory be right or wrong, it ought to stand or fall upon its own claims. It certainly is not "Monroe doctrine." It is just as clearly "Roosevelt doctrine." The original Monroe doctrine of 1823 is very easy to understand. As affirmed by Adams and Monroe, it involved three things. 1. The American continents were not to be subject to colonization by any European power. 2. We could not permit any intervention by any European power in the affairs of the South American Republics "for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any other manner their destiny." 3. We could not permit the extension by the allied powers—that is, the members of the "Holy Alliance," formed by the sovereigns of Russia, Austria, and Prussia after the congress of Vienna in 1815—of their political system to any portion of North or South America.

When, about 1845, President Polk practically took the position that it was the duty of the United States to annex adjacent territory in order to prevent its annexation by European countries; and when, in 1881, Mr. Blaine held, in substance, that the United States was the sole guardian of transit across the Isthmus of Panama and the arbiter of disputes between the Latin-American States; and when, in 1895, Mr. Olney announced that the United States is sovereign in America, that the British colonies in America are temporary, and that these propositions are a part of international law, the prestige of the Monroe doctrine was invoked in favor of these various formulations of our international policy. Yet nothing is clearer than that all these involved distinct variations from the Monroe doctrine. Undoubtedly considerations based on national advantage, duty, and safety could be advanced on the one side and on the other in each of these cases. But that should have been the only method of argument. To introduce the Monroe doctrine was only to confuse both the nature of that doctrine and that of the new problems. The same is true in regard to the Roosevelt doctrine of our general guardianship of the countries to the south of us with responsibilities to their creditors. Whether right or wrong, and I decidedly believe it to be wrong, it is certainly new, and it ought to be examined on its merits without receiving any shelter or warrant whatever from the Monroe doctrine.

This tendency of the Executive, upon which I have been briefly commenting, has involved us in grave national wrong. The conduct of this Government under the lead of the President of the United States in regard to the means by which the independence of Panama was recognized and the arrangements were made for the construction of the Panama Canal is, in my opinion, an indelible stain upon the fair fame and good faith of this Government. In order that the object had in view by the President should be achieved it was necessary to override a statute of the United States, to break a solemn treaty with a foreign government, and to commit an act of war, and without authority of Congress, against a people with whom we were at peace. The law known as the Spooner Act expressly directed the President of the United States to proceed with the construction of the Nicaragua Canal if, within a reasonable time, he could not secure the consent of the Government of the United States of Colombia to the treaty providing for the construction of the canal across the Isthmus of Panama. That consent he did not obtain.

It is beside the question to contend that the United States of Colombia ought to have ratified the treaty. It is an independent government and had a right to reject the treaty if it chose to without giving us any reason whatever. But, upon

the rejection of the treaty, instead of proceeding to carry out the plain and specific direction of the act of Congress to construct the Nicaragua Canal, the President of the United States recognized the independence of Panama, a revolted province of the United States of Colombia, used the armed forces of the United States to prevent Colombia from reestablishing her authority over that territory, despite our solemn engagement in the treaty of 1846 to respect the integrity of her domain; which was unquestionably an act of war upon our part, made a treaty with the new State, and proceeded with what difficulties and scandals the world is aware, to the present stage of the canal construction across the Isthmus. There have not been wanting grave insinuations touching our complicity in the revolution of Panama against Colombia. Certainly the appearance of our gunboats at a time and place when and where Bunau Varilla had promised the revolutionists they should appear, and their effectual action in defeating any attempt by Colombia to recover her province, are circumstances strongly confirmatory of the suspicion; nor does the suspicion involve, if justified, any greater dishonor on our part than that which already attaches to us from the admitted circumstances.

We are at this moment confronted with another threatened act of Executive disregard of the obligations of the country in the matter of the Isle of Pines. On this island, of the approximately 1,800 resident property owners the Americans number about one-half. Over 2,500 Americans own property there, their total holdings comprising about ninety per cent of all the real estate of the island. There is pending in the Senate of the United States a treaty urged by the President and the Secretary of State, ceding this island to the Republic of Cuba. Against this act the American residents of the island are loudly protesting, but they are in grave peril, if the influence of the Executive shall be sufficient to force the confirmation of the treaty. Article VI of the so-called "Platt amendment," by which virtually the government of Cuba was created, provides:

VI. That the Isle of Pines shall be omitted from the proposed constitutional boundaries of Cuba, the title thereto being left for future adjustment by treaty.

No claim can be successfully made that this island passed to Cuba under the treaty of peace with Spain, for Article II of that treaty provided:

Spain cedes to the United States the island of Porto Rico and other islands now under Spanish sovereignty in the West Indies.

And Article VIII provides:

* * * Spain relinquishes in Cuba and cedes in Porto Rico and other islands in the West Indies * * * all the buildings, etc.

In both these articles the translation of the Spanish text is scarcely fair, in Article II the expression "*las demas*" and in Article VIII the words "*las otras islas*" being rendered "other islands" instead of "the other islands," as they ought to be.

And yet in spite of the fact that by a fair construction of the language of the treaty with Spain the Isle of Pines passed to the United States, in spite of the fact that on that assumption a large number of American citizens have acquired property there and have gone there to live, and in spite of the fact that the Platt amendment itself expressly leaves the title to the island to be determined by treaty, the Secretary of State, in a letter of November 27, 1905, informed Mr. Charles Reynard, president of the America Club of the Isle of Pines, among other things, as follows:

The island is lawfully subject to the control and government of the Republic of Cuba, and you and your associates are bound to render obedience to the laws of that country so long as you remain on the island. If you fail in that obedience you will be justly liable to prosecution in the Cuban courts, and to such punishment as may be provided for such offenses as you commit. You are not likely to have any greater power in the future. The treaty now pending before the Senate, if approved by that body, will relinquish all claim of the United States to the Isle of Pines. * * * You may be quite sure that Cuba will never consent to give up the Isle of Pines, and that the United States will never try to compel her to give it up against her will.

The Isle of Pines is of course a small island. Its inhabitants are few. They perhaps can make but slight reprisal, either political or otherwise, for any wrong that may be done them. But I believe the American people, when fully informed on the subject, will insist that justice be done to those Americans who have cast their fortunes there in reliance upon the terms of the Spanish treaty and the manifest intentment of the Platt amendment.

Not long ago, in a remarkable special message to Congress, the President strayed into the judicial reservations of the Constitution by bringing to book a Federal judge (Humphries) for an opinion rendered by him in the ordinary discharge of his judicial functions, an unprecedented proceeding that would have jarred the credulity of "the fathers."

Sir, in connection with this matter of the proper observance by the Executive of the line of demarcation between it and the

legislative branch of this Government, there has recently occurred a bit of history that I am not anxious to rehearse, and to which I shall now refer in passing only to use it as an illustration of the proposition I am trying to enforce. It is not pleasant to examine, and I shall not examine, the question of veracity that has been raised between the President of the United States and certain other honorable and reputable gentlemen. It is exceedingly to be regretted that the present Chief Magistrate has had the misfortune to raise the question of veracity with nearly every public character he has come in contact with during his Administration. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Does the gentleman mean to let that statement go in the RECORD?

Mr. TOWNE. What is that?

Mr. PAYNE. Does the gentleman mean to make such a broad statement as that "nearly every" —

Mr. TOWNE. No, I will say instead, "with a very great many." The returns are not all in. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now, sir, what I want to say in that connection is this—and it rises infinitely above any mere question of veracity, as to which question I do not state any present judgment or desire to be thought as stating any: There is in the Chief Executive a certain quickness and caprice of temper which first expresses itself without limitation, and then remembers without accuracy. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But there are certain respects, Mr. Chairman, in which a result of this unfortunate experience is of the very greatest importance to the people of the United States. In the last campaign it was admitted in many places throughout the country that the accusations brought against the Republican party as to its complicity and partnership with those great economic forces that to-day prevail in the civilized world were true. Republicans in many places admitted it. The answer that was made to the charge was, in substance, that the character of your candidate for the Presidency would save you from the sins of your party. "Vote for Roosevelt, not for the Republican party; he is bigger and better than the party," was the cry that saved your party in that election, my friends on the other side.

There were many thousands of Democrats in the country who believed, whether rightly or not, that the Democratic candidate for the Presidency was largely sponsored by and representative of the interests claimed by the masses of the Democratic party to be in league with the Republican party. So that the consequence was that many thousands of Republicans who would otherwise have voted against their party, and many thousands of Democrats who would otherwise have voted for their party, voted together for Roosevelt. When he came into office he had a sanction that no other elective official in the history of the world has had. He had great excuse to regard the vote he received as in the nature of a plebiscite, as a vote of general public confidence, in a sense substituting him as the direct representative of the people in a more emphatic way than the popular legislative body itself could be regarded as so representative. It gave him a most commanding position. There is every evidence that he realized it. From that eminence he could and did choose his allies to carry out his ideas of legislation. The opportunity afforded him permanently to maintain a position above the trammels of party was never before presented to a Chief Magistrate of the United States, unless to the great Washington himself.

In the Senate a combination was made with some Republicans and many Democrats, as we are informed on the highest authority, an authority I have not seen challenged, whereby an arrangement was reached guaranteeing 47 and probably 50 votes to the President, a clear and sufficient majority of the Senate, to pass the so-called Hepburn railroad-rate bill with amendments providing for a restricted court review and a suspension of the power of interlocutory injunction. Here was a certainty of the ability to pass this great legislation in practically exact conformity with the declarations of his wish and purpose which the President had repeatedly made. But, sir, within twenty-six hours after that agreement was reached, without notice to his allies, even to his ally in his own Cabinet, the Attorney-General, that arrangement was abandoned by the President, and another was entered into which commanded the support of, and is now known to be eminently satisfactory to, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, whose opposition to the President has, in the estimation of many of his admirers in the country, been one of the President's chief glories. The so-called "railroad Republicans" were the air of conquerors. The Democrats were thrown out. This vaunted nonpartisan railroad-rate legislation became, so far as the President and his new Republican allies could make it so, a partisan measure, and the Chief Magistrate of the United States, shorn of his

original barbaric power, manacled and humbled, like another Caractacus, but rejoicing in his bonds, walked by the chariot wheel of the triumphant Duke of Rhode Island. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, one great political result of this experience is this, that in the important campaigns of this year and 1908 you can not cover the defects of your party with the alleged excellencies of your candidate. The people of this country know that no man ever had a chance to be bigger than his party equal to the chance which Theodore Roosevelt had, and lost. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Henceforth our fight is against the Republican party and its iniquities, and Roosevelt is out of the way. He has repudiated his Democratic allies and forsworn his greater allegiance to the people, and he is now bound hand and foot to the coterie at the other end of the Capitol that dominates Republican politics in that body and in the country. He has formally abdicated his independence. He has willingly submitted himself to the party yoke. It is a pitiful surrender, but it will not be without its good effects upon the history of the country.

My friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS], who closed his remarkable speech of yesterday with the statement that this country is the best country in the world, is by nature no more an optimist than I am. I thank God, sir, that it is the best country in the world. I devoutly hope that the party to which I belong may always be devoted to those fundamental principles which make it the best country in the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We are face to face with a crisis in the industrial life of this country, in solemnity and importance, so far as I know, without precedent or parallel. Upon one side stands the Republican party indissolubly linked, as an organization, to those dominant powers of combination, concentration, centralization, and monopoly that have given its characteristic economic complexion to the history of the last thirty years. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

On the other side, there is abroad in the land a growing aggregation of resentment and anger because of wrongs that have not been redressed, of rights that have been taken away, of hope that has been deferred. We hear the mutterings and whisperings of a threatened uprising in the name of socialism against tyranny that has arisen out of exaggerated individualism based upon special privilege under the laws. In this hour, sir, it is my profound belief that the safety of my country is in the guardianship of the Democratic party, a party whose principles are coeval with the Constitution itself, whose perpetuity is necessarily associated with the permanence of those principles; a party equally opposed to the tyranny of the few and the oppression of the many, and which offers, in its fundamental allegiance to the inviolability of private property on the one hand and of individual liberty on the other, a refuge to the people from both monopoly and anarchy. In this confidence, sir, we shall go before the citizenship of this great Republic in the coming campaign, contending for those basic, characteristic, original, and necessary American doctrines upon which the country has achieved its glory and to which it must continue to be loyal if it shall survive to fulfill the prophecies of the patriots that have lived and died for it. [Loud applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. CRUMPACKER having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolution of the following titles:

H. R. 16950. An act to enlarge the authority of the Mississippi River Commission in making allotments and expenditures of funds appropriated by Congress for the improvement of the Mississippi River;

H. R. 17114. An act to provide for the disposition under the public land laws of the lands in the abandoned Fort Shaw Military Reservation, Mont.;

H. R. 8952. An act for the relief of the trustees of Weir's Chapel, Tiptah County, Miss.;

H. R. 16672. An act to punish the cutting, chipping, or boxing of trees on the public lands; and

H. J. Res. 98. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish brass cannon to the General Howell Post, No. 31, Grand Army of the Republic, of Woodbury, N. J.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 17842) granting a pension to Josephine V. Sparks, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House thereon, and had appointed Mr. McCUMBER, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. TALLAFERRO as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills

of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 6231. An act to establish a fund for public works in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes;

S. 5675. An act for the relief of Maj. Seymour Howell, United States Army, retired;

S. 1570. An act granting an increase of pension to Lydia A. Johnson;

S. 350. An act for the relief of the heirs of Joseph Sierra, deceased; and

S. 4403. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States," approved March 3, 1903.

CONSULAR AND DIPLOMATIC APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of attention to the highly intellectual effort of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Towne], a large part of which was devoted to "the gentleman from New York," and a sentence or two of which was devoted to the headlines of a supposed speech of mine discreetly without any reference to the speech itself. I want to assure the gentleman from New York that the money question is no longer a live question, and that the question as to what party the gentleman from New York at any particular time belongs is not a live question, if it ever was. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] Nor is there any gentleman on this side of the House—and I might extend the range of my remarks further, and say in the country, I believe—who cares whether the gentleman from New York takes the risk of a Congressional election in Minnesota or takes a detail from Tammany Hall. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I propose to address myself, Mr. Chairman, for a short time to the question of tariff revision. It is loudly and persistently urged from the other side of this Chamber that there is a general and crying demand for tariff revision, and that the Republican party is false to the pledges of its last national platform in failing to respond to that demand. I deny the truth of both of these assertions. On the contrary, I contend that outside of the Democratic party there is no demand for general tariff revision, nor even a consensus of opinion in favor of an alteration of any certain schedules; and that the attitude of those who now oppose revision is in entire consistency with the declaration of the last Republican platform.

Before I come to quote from that platform, I desire to say to our friends upon the other side that, about to enter upon a campaign for the control of this House in the next Congress, there is no issue that we more warmly welcome than that of protection. On every stump, from every rostrum throughout the length and breadth of this land where suffrage is not suppressed, we will appeal to the people basking in the sunshine of an unexampled prosperity as against the authors of the blackest chapter in our recent industrial history. [Loud applause on the Republican side.] The Republican platform of 1904 says:

We replaced a Democratic tariff law based on free trade principles and garnished with sectional protection by a consistent protective tariff; and industry, freed from oppression and stimulated by the encouragement of wise laws, has expanded to a degree never before known, has conquered new markets, and has created a volume of exports which has surpassed imagination. Under the Dingley tariff labor has been fully employed, wages have risen, and all industries have revived and prospered.

We promise to continue these policies.

The platform further said:

Rates of duty should be readjusted *only* when conditions have so changed that the public interest demands their alteration.

The declaration in the platform in respect to the contrasting results of Democratic and Republican policies, was eminently correct. It correctly represented the conditions as they then existed, and the causes from which those conditions resulted. What were the conditions then, and what are the conditions now? In what respect has there been a change, calling for a readjustment of the rates of duty in the public interest? I contend that there has been none.

It will be necessary that I indulge in a brief retrospect. In November, 1892, Grover Cleveland was elected President of the United States and the Democratic party came into power in all departments of the Government pledged to revise the tariff. Within less than a month thereafter President Harrison sent to Congress his last message. I want to read from that message. He said:

I have great satisfaction in being able to say that the general conditions affecting commercial and industrial interests in the United States are in the highest degree favorable. A comparison of those existing conditions with those of the most favored period in the history

of the country will, I believe, show that so high a degree of prosperity and so general diffusion of the comforts of life were never before enjoyed by our people.

I have heard that assertion of Mr. Harrison denied upon the floor of this House, but it was the exact truth, as is capable of abundant proof. For instance, Dun's Review of Trade, in December, 1892, said:

The most prosperous year ever known in business closes to-morrow with strongly favorable indications for the future. For this year the volume of settlements throughout the clearing houses is the largest ever known; the largest total of exports and imports ever known in any year; unprecedented purchases for consumption; manufacturers have made extraordinary progress. The year closes with all woolen, cotton, and silk machinery fully employed and unsold stocks much lighter than usual, while the demand for the coming season already exceeds the capacity of many mills. Shipments of boots and shoes from the East have been 5 per cent larger than any previous year.

So much for Mr. Harrison and so much for Dun's Review. Now for some Democratic testimony. I find that Mr. Edward Atkinson, well known as a free trader from Boston, in an article in the Forum for May, 1892, says this:

There has never been a period in the history of this or any other country when the general rate of wages was as high as it is now, or the price of goods relatively to the wages as low as they are to-day, nor a period when the workman, in the strictest sense of the word, has so fully secured to his own use and enjoyment such a steadily and progressively increasing proportion of a constantly increasing product.

The country then seemed to be on the very top wave of prosperity, and yet within a short time thereafter it was plunged into the most deplorable condition known to our history. Why? Because the people of this country feared the consequences of a Democratic administration; because, especially, they feared the passage of a Democratic tariff law.

Our people have not forgotten the four years from 1893 to 1897, when furnace fires were extinguished, when mill doors were closed, when the music of the spindle and the loom was hushed. There was a paralysis of business, and throughout the length and breadth of this great land was heard the tramp, tramp of men who were marching to the music of despair. Confidence, the basis of all success, was dethroned, and distrust reigned in its stead.

The Wilson-Gorman bill, delayed a long time in its birth, was not sufficiently a free-trade measure to satisfy Mr. Cleveland, but it was sufficient to impair in large degree the business interests of this country. During the four years of Cleveland's administration our bank clearings fell off ten billions of dollars, our exports fell two hundred and twenty-nine millions, and, on the other hand, our imports increased twenty millions of dollars. It was a time when the wage-earner instead of hoarding was spending, and the capitalist instead of spending was hoarding. During those disastrous four years the national revenues failed to meet the national expenses by one hundred and fifty-six millions of dollars. The national treasury was empty. The gold reserve was depleted to pay the ordinary current expenses of the Government. In a time of profound peace we borrowed on bonds two hundred and sixty-two millions of dollars. Three millions of men were out of work. One third of our railroads were in the hands of receivers. Iron and steel products fell off one-third. And there is no such accurate barometer of prosperity as the production of iron and steel.

The calamitous conditions, that I have only briefly and in outline described, came to an end in 1896 by the election to the presidency of the man who was known to the people as the champion of protection, William McKinley. [Applause on the Republican side.]

As a result of that election we regained our birthright, the country came to its own again, and came to it through the open door of protection. Promptly following the election of Mr. McKinley and a Republican Congress came the Dingley law, the law existing to-day.

With what result?

With the result that the country quickly recovered itself. Distrust gave way to confidence, and in every respect we started on the upward road to prosperity, so that when the Republican National Convention met in Chicago in June, 1904, we had advanced a long ways along that road. Let us see.

Our bank deposits were then the largest they had ever been. We had more money in circulation than ever before. We had more iron and steel and coal, more agricultural products, more manufactures than ever before. Wages were higher, employment more universal, working hours shorter. Our revenues were adequate. We had accumulated a surplus. In every respect, from whatever standpoint viewed, the situation was most favorable. Our home trade was equal to the aggregate exports and imports of all the other nations in the world. What we did among ourselves in the way of business in these forty-five States was equal to the world's international commerce. Our home trade for 1903 was estimated at \$23,000,000,000. That was the business of our home market, the greatest market

on the face of the earth, and our foreign trade had grown to large proportions. We had made some progress in the invasion of foreign markets. We were selling our products in Canada, in Germany, in France, in Great Britain, and in Russia in the Far East. Americans were building railroads in London, bridges in Africa, constructing battle ships and making armor for Russia and Japan, and my fellow-townsmen, George Westinghouse, had grasped the electric trade of Great Britain. [Applause on the Republican side.]

We were the greatest manufacturing nation on the face of the earth, not excluding England. We were making annually more steel in the Pittsburgh district than Great Britain was making—Great Britain but lately the manufacturing mistress of the world. Since the passage of the Dingley law we had become the greatest of exporting nations. In 1865 there were four nations struggling for the supremacy—Great Britain, France, Germany, and the United States. Great Britain was first and the United States stood fourth. In 1885 Great Britain still stood first and the United States third. In 1903 the United States marched past Great Britain and took her place as the first exporting nation in the world. In the year before the Chicago convention we had sold in foreign markets \$1,400,000,000 worth. It is only within a few years that we have become exporters of manufactured goods and yet in 1903 our exports of manufactures reached the amazing figure of \$460,000,000, and the balance of trade in our favor was \$400,000,000. During the seven years of Republican administration that had passed when the Chicago convention met the balance of trade in our favor was nearly ten times as great as the aggregate balances of trade during all the years from Washington to McKinley. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have not the time nor is it necessary that I should go further into details in this direction. I have said sufficient to show what were the conditions that existed at the time of the adoption of the Republican national platform. With respect to the policies from which these conditions resulted that platform said, "We promise to continue these policies." That promise still abides with us, and we propose still to abide with it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But we said that we would readjust duties when conditions so changed that the public interest demanded their alteration. In what respect have conditions changed since the adoption of the Republican platform in 1904?

I answer that conditions have changed only for the better. [Applause on the Republican side.] I have an astonishing statement here which I got yesterday from the Census Bureau, which shows that within the five years from 1900 to 1905, half a decade, in 42 States of this country capital has increased 41.8 per cent, wage-earners have increased 15.6 per cent; and strangest of all, and proof positive as to the wage rate in this country, while wage-earners have increased 15.6 per cent, wages have increased nearly twice as much, or 31.5 per cent, and products have increased 30.1 per cent. Now, I have here a comparison as between 1900 and 1905, relating especially to half a dozen Southern States. I selected the Southern States because I wanted to show that in that region where the Democratic party prevailed Republican prosperity had entered.

Take, for instance, the State of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. Capital has increased in five years in that gentleman's State 121.2 per cent. Wage-earners have increased 44.4 per cent. Wages have increased 87.4 per cent, and the product has increased 70.4 per cent, and yet the gentleman from Mississippi would have us believe that we are not so very prosperous.

The figures for the States to which I have referred are as follows:

State.	Capital.	Wage-earners.	Wages.	Product.
	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.
Mississippi	121.2	44.4	87.4	70.4
Missouri	68.9	23.6	42.4	38.7
North Carolina	106.5	18	52.1	67.1
Tennessee	62.2	31.7	54.9	48.7
Texas	81.7	27.1	44.7	62
Virginia	60.3	21.2	37.8	37
Alabama	75.3	18	46.8	51.4

These are certainly astonishing figures and full of encouragement.

Now, I say that since our platform was adopted in 1904, in every particular relating to our prosperity as a people, we have made distinct and conspicuous progress.

Mr. STANLEY. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield for a question?

Mr. DALZELL. I will yield for a question.

Mr. STANLEY. I want to ask the gentleman if he will be kind enough to put in the Record the basis of those figures—the authority for them.

Mr. DALZELL. The gentleman will find the figures in the bulletins published by the Census Bureau of the manufactures of the various States of the Union. These figures are taken from those bulletins, and are official figures. I say in every particular relating to our prosperity as a people we have made distinct and conspicuous advance. For instance, our money in circulation has increased sixty-eight and three-quarters million dollars. Our national bank capital has increased over \$24,000,000. Our savings-bank deposits, which more than anything else show the prosperity of our people, have increased over \$174,000,000, and the total of our bank deposits has increased over \$1,250,000,000.

Our foreign commerce for the fiscal year ending June, 1905, exceeds that of any preceding year. The increase in the exports over the preceding year was fifty-six and one-half million dollars. That shows our ability to compete in foreign markets. The imports for the same period increased over those of the preceding year by over \$63,000,000, and that shows the extent to which the foreigner competes in our market. Forty-six and five-tenths per cent of those imports came in free of duty.

Whether in the domain of commerce, in the domain of manufactures or in the domain of agriculture, last year was the greatest year that this country ever knew. But above all these figures of material wealth are to be regarded the general morality and intelligence of our people, their facilities for education, for intellectual progress which find opportunity for development only in a period of general contentment and confidence such as now exists.

Now, my friends, do these conditions indicate that the public interests demand a change in our tariff schedules? Certainly not. Public interest and national prosperity are interchangeable terms. What constitutes national prosperity? Many things in combination. The magnitude of a nation's commerce, the supremacy of its manufactures, the wealth of its agriculture, coincident with enlarged markets for the consumption of its products at remunerative prices, the general employment of its citizens at an adequate wage, and withal a sound credit and the universal contentment of its people. Neither alone nor in combination did these things exist when the Wilson-Gorman bill was in process of enactment, or subsequent thereto.

All of them have existed since the passage of the Dingley law, did exist when the Republican platform was adopted in 1904, and all of them exist in an enlarged degree to-day. [Applause on the Republican side.] It is not necessary to our contention to claim that these things are wholly the fruits of protection, although they are in large part. Sufficient for us to know that they coexist with protection and the lesson they teach us is to let well enough alone. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I submit that the changes contemplated by the Republican platform as calling for an alteration of our tariff laws do not exist. Furthermore a revision of the tariff at this time could not but result in harm. All experience shows that tariff agitation, business depression, and temporary business paralysis come together. Let me quote again from the message of Mr. Harrison, to which I made reference a little while ago. Mr. Harrison said:

The threat of great tariff changes induces so much uncertainty that an amount not easily estimated of business inaction and of diminished production will certainly result. It is possible also that this uncertainty may result in decreased revenues on customs duties, for our merchants will make cautious orders for foreign goods in view of the prospect of tariff reductions and the uncertainties as to when they will take effect.

It is claimed that there are inequalities in the existing tariff schedules. Undoubtedly there are, but there is no consensus of opinion as to what those inequalities are, and it is not in human nature or human power to construct a tariff bill that would not contain inequalities. Experience shows that the existing inequalities do not operate to prevent successful working of the law or are in any material respect detrimental to the public interests. Business conditions have adapted themselves to the present law. They fit into each other. Why make a change?

Who is it, Mr. Chairman, let me ask, that is now clamoring for tariff revision? It is not the laborers of this country, for, universally employed, they find in existing conditions unlimited opportunities to work at the highest wage rate ever known, a wage that enables them to live up to the requirements of an intelligent American citizenship and to educate their children.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman speaks about the increase in wages. I would like to ask the gentleman if the increase in wages has been as great as the increase in the cost of living.

Mr. DALZELL. I think it has, and greater.

Mr. RUCKER. Has the gentleman any figures on that subject?

Mr. DALZELL. Well, there is a bulletin published by the labor bureau—

Mr. RUCKER. And does not that bulletin show conclusively that the opposite is the fact?

Mr. DALZELL. I think not. I just quoted a little while ago to the gentleman what seems to me to be conclusive proof as to the rise of wages, how wages have risen to twice as great an extent as the number of wage earners, according to the figures from the Census Bureau.

Mr. RUCKER. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not true as shown by official statistics that wages were higher in 1890 than they were in 1900?

Mr. DALZELL. Possibly in some employments, but not in all.

Mr. RUCKER. In all employments.

Mr. DALZELL. Not at all.

Mr. RUCKER. Do not the statistics show it?

Mr. DALZELL. I say they do not.

Mr. RUCKER. Then the gentleman differs from the facts as shown by the statistics.

Mr. DALZELL. Well, then, for the present, at least, we shall have to differ. I say not the laborers. They are not clamoring for tariff changes. It is not the farmers of this country, for they find for their products the splendid market created by the large army of wage-earning consumers. Not the farmers, I say, for they have been released from their farm mortgages, and their accumulations are filling to overflowing the savings banks of every city and town in this happy land. Not the great body of artisans, for they live in contentment, enjoying the fruits and the luxuries even that make life worth living. Not any or all of these. Who then?

The producers of other lands who cast longing eyes to the tempting markets of 80,000,000 of prosperous people. Every manufacturer in England, in Germany, in France, in Canada, or elsewhere who has no interest here, but is looking out for his own, is in favor of a revision of the American tariff. So is the great body of importers, many of them aliens. So are the rich men with fixed incomes who are in favor of dear money and cheap labor. So is the Democratic party, lean and hungry from its long wandering in the desert, hopeless, thirsty for patronage and power. So is every Democratic doctrinaire, every disciple of Bastiat and Cobden, and the Manchester school, free trader at heart with his mouth full of catchwords, willing hypocritically to assume a belief in any doctrine that he thinks may catch the popular ear. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly, with pleasure.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does Governor Cummins of Iowa and the Massachusetts Republican delegation in this House belong to any of the classes that the gentleman has just enumerated?

Mr. DALZELL. I am just about to come to this class now.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am glad the gentleman is.

Mr. DALZELL. So far as Governor Cummins is concerned, of course, I have no personal knowledge, but I have been informed he is on the back track now. So far as our other friends are concerned, I was going to pay them my compliments by saying that in addition to the Democratic and mugwump press and all that portion which sails under the name of "independent" might be added our few discontented friends who believe in free trade in what they are pleased to call "raw materials" and in protection on their finished products. Then there is a little coterie here and there who would fain have some particular schedule of the Dingley bill readjusted, but there is no considerable body of them that can agree on the particular schedule which shall be readjusted.

And let me tell my friend from Missouri, with the forces thus arrayed, with the laborer and the farmer and the artisan and the great body of contented citizens upon one side and the foreigner across the seas and the free trader at home, avowed or masked on the other side, and the small contingent of the discontented, there can be no doubt as to what would be the result of a popular vote. [Applause on the Republican side.] For answer there comes yet the reverberating roar of the last Presidential election and the potential voice of the great American electorate enthusiastic followers after the banner on which is inscribed "Protection to American industries!" [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. One more question, Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. DALZELL. I do.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What about the reverberating roar of the election in Ohio and Pennsylvania in 1905?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman let me answer that?

Mr. DALZELL. You can answer for Ohio.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The reverberating roar in Ohio was the election of the entire State ticket with the exception of governor by a very large majority, one branch of the legislature Republican and the other Democratic by 1 majority.

Mr. KEIFER. Forty thousand Republican majority.

Mr. DALZELL. The reverberating roar in Pennsylvania was the election of a Democratic State treasurer and all the rest of the Republican ticket.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What about the hundred thousand majority when the State went half a million for Roosevelt?

Mr. DALZELL. It was because the people believed, without regard to whether they were Democrats or Republicans or Prohibitionists or Mugwumps, that the time had come when honest men ought to assert themselves in the election of a State treasurer; and the Republicans were honest enough and manly enough to come to the fore and elect a man whom they believed to be honest without regard to his party affiliations. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. One other question and then I will quit. Is that the reason Pittsburg went Democratic in April?

Mr. DALZELL. No; Pittsburg did not go Democratic.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Did not Pittsburg elect a Democratic mayor?

Mr. DALZELL. Yes; a Democratic mayor, but the gentleman is misinformed. Pittsburg did not go Democratic. There was a fusion ticket and it was made for the same reason I have already given as to the State, and I suppose that is the same reason that induced Missouri to go Republican in the last election. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will tell you what induced Missouri to go Republican. It was Parker's telegram that made 46,000 Democrats stay at home.

Mr. DALZELL. Well, they were wiser, Democrats than Democrats usually are. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri if he recalls the name of the distinguished Democrat of this country who formally notified Alton B. Parker of his nomination. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. I want to ask the gentleman if the last Presidential candidate but one destroyed the party and the last candidate caused 40,000 Democrats to stay at home in one State, what will happen the next time? [Laughter.]

Mr. DALZELL. Now, Mr. Chairman, what are the arguments that our Democratic friends present in favor of tariff revision? They may be found, I think, under three heads. First, hostility to the protective system; secondly, an old campaign cry not very successful in the past, but revamped for present use with sundry embellishments and misrepresentations, to wit, that we sell our goods abroad at a less price than we sell them for at home, and third and largely, declamation.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania allow me to ask a question, not so much as to where we sell our goods but how we make our goods? Can the gentleman from Pennsylvania name me any steel mill in the world that can make steel rails cheaper than they are made at Pittsburg? Can the gentleman from Pennsylvania name me any iron furnace in the world that can make pig iron cheaper than at Birmingham?

Mr. DALZELL. I think not; and I am coming to that question, if the gentleman will have patience, in a few moments.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Do we need protection to protect us against the market that we can meet cheaper than anybody else?

Mr. DALZELL. I will answer the gentleman's question in due course if he will have the patience.

Do we sell goods abroad cheaper than we do at home? Undoubtedly, sometimes—certain kinds of goods—the kind of goods the sale of which promises us a foothold in a foreign market, and to a limited extent, to wit, to the extent of our surplus. Why? Well, for a number of reasons—all of them patent to business men. The first and foremost, because our home production exceeds our home consumption; and the excess of production must be sold in a foreign market or our factories and our workmen remain during a portion of each year idle.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALZELL. For a question, yes.

Mr. PADGETT. Do you contend that the sale of five hundred million of manufactured products abroad was simply the sale of excess or surplus?

Mr. DALZELL. But I am not talking about the total of our foreign sales, but about the goods that are alleged to be sold abroad at lower prices than they are sold for at home.

Mr. PADGETT. I want to ask the gentleman this question: Do you contend that that five hundred millions are surplus or excess?

Mr. DALZELL. Why, not at all.

Mr. PADGETT. Then were they not all sold abroad in competition with foreign conditions?

Mr. DALZELL. Of course they were.

Mr. PADGETT. Then why do we need artificial stimulus here if we can sell five hundred millions in competition at their own door?

Mr. DALZELL. I think I have already substantially answered the gentleman's question. We have in this country, by reason of the skill of our workmen, by reason of our general prosperity, by reason of our inventive genius, by reason of our improved machinery, arrived at a period when we can make in this country on an average of nine months all that the country can consume in the year.

It is a plain business proposition whether or not we shall run the year around and sell all of our goods in any market, or whether we shall run nine months and close up our factories the other three. But that is not the only reason. Another reason is because, in order to gain a foothold in foreign markets, the price must be regulated so as to meet the price in the foreign market with which we come in competition. And another reason is because, in our contest for entrance into the world's markets, we have to encounter a system of tariffs, of syndicates, of cartels, of bounties, all of which were made for the purpose of excluding us from those markets. And another reason is because it is a custom as old as commerce itself, and a universally recognized industrial policy. And still another reason is because the merchants of all countries have two schedules of prices—a home price and an export price.

Now, in what way does this practice help us? It keeps our factories going and our men from idleness. It maintains the American wage. It secures us a foothold in, and, ultimately, to some extent, a command of foreign markets. It does no harm. It does not result in adding to the price to the home consumer, for the reason, first, that it is not of such extent as to affect the price to the home consumer, and second, because a comparison of home prices with foreign prices will show that our home prices are as low, and sometimes lower, than those abroad.

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. Is not that surplus that you speak of the result of selling abroad at a lower price than you are willing to sell at home, and if you would reduce the price to the home consumer to the same level to which you sell that surplus abroad, would not the surplus disappear? Would not that surplus be absorbed by the home consumer?

Mr. DALZELL. In other words, after the man is full you can make him fuller. After the country is supplied, then dump on them the surplus. That is the remedy suggested by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], who said, "Why do you not sell your surplus in your home market?"

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. Reduce the price, and the surplus that you speak of would disappear.

Mr. DALZELL. This country can only take so much of anything at any price, and, when the home market is supplied, the surplus must go abroad.

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. Would the gentleman be willing to sell to the home consumer at the same price at which he sells that surplus abroad?

Mr. DALZELL. I understand the gentleman's question. It resolves itself into simply what I said a moment ago. After you have got the market fully supplied, supply it over again with the surplus.

Mr. STANLEY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. DALZELL. Yes.

Mr. STANLEY. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania mean to contend that you not only supply the wants but the desires of the people? That they have got all they need, and all they buy, and also all they want?

Mr. DALZELL. I think so. I think that condition of things exists in this country to-day, absolutely.

Now, the gentleman from Alabama asked a little while ago, "Then why do we need protection?" Well, because under the conditions I am describing protection does no harm. We

need protection for the purpose of preventing foreigners from entering our markets as a dumping ground and from making war on our markets in periods of depression in their home market. Now, that is not a matter of theory. It is a matter of experience. Let me illustrate:

In the calendar year 1900 we imported iron and steel and manufactures of iron and steel to the amount of \$20,443,911, and in 1901 our imports of these commodities amounted to \$20,394,995. These are foreign values. Our imports of iron and steel early in 1902 were increasing, notwithstanding the Dingley tariff. The Iron Age for January 16 reported the sale of 3,000 tons of foreign billets for delivery at Youngstown, Ohio, at \$27.50 per ton, with further business pending. It added that a number of eastern consumers were using small quantities of foreign steel. The Iron Trade Review of the same date said that a large quantity of German Bessemer pig iron had been sold for delivery in this country, and it noted the sale of 7,000 tons of English Bessemer pig iron also to this country. It said further that "a recent sale of German spiegeleisen for export to the United States indicated that our steel makers have not been able to supply their wants from such of their furnaces as ordinarily run on spiegel," and added that "the importation of steel is also expected to grow steadily in the coming months." A telegraphic dispatch from Berlin, Germany, to the London Iron and Coal Trades Review of December 6, 1901, said:

Our exports continue to increase. German manufacturers have even shipped to America sheets for tin plates, and even thick iron sheets, also half finished products; and in the month of October the quantity of the latter and of finished products exported was nearly equal to half our total production of pig iron.

There was a period, you will observe, when we needed all the protection we had to prevent foreign incursions into our market.

But even if the custom that we are discussing were admitted to be an evil, cutting down the tariff would not remedy it except by ruining our industries to such an extent that we would have no goods to sell in the foreign market and very much less to sell in the home market. The cure would be worse than the disease.

Notwithstanding what our friends upon the other side say, there is no secrecy about this commercial custom. It is not done in a corner, and it needs no excuse or apology.

The United States Steel Company, in its last annual report, a public document, dated December 31, 1905, uses this language:

The prices received for export during the year were materially in excess of those previously received, and approached more closely domestic prices. It is the policy of manufacturers to keep the furnaces, mills, and transportation companies in operation to their full capacity whenever practicable. Obviously this is wise. It results in lower cost of production and thereby influences lower prices generally to the domestic purchaser, and it secures continuous employment to the wage-earner. For these reasons it is sometimes deemed proper and desirable to sell for export what otherwise would be surplus product at prices lower than domestic prices. If a contrary policy should be adopted, the general cost of production would be increased, the employee at times would be idle, and the balance of trade between foreign countries and this country would be changed to the prejudice of the latter. This policy has been adopted, and is practiced generally throughout the business world. However, trade conditions during 1905 enabled the manufacturers of steel in this country to realize fair prices for their export commodities.

I might quote testimony of others of a similar character ad infinitum. There is no end of it in the hearings that were had by the Industrial Commission. So that notwithstanding the claims of our friends upon the other side, this is not any secret matter, nor a matter needing, as I said, excuse or apology. The real question is how much do we sell abroad at a lower price than we sell at home?

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is a material question that can not be answered by vague and irresponsible statements and by loud declamation. What is said here and there by this man and that man in general terms may have some bearing upon the question as to whether we sell abroad at lower prices or not, but has no bearing upon the question as to the extent of the custom. It simply serves to confuse the issue.

Statistics gathered by a nonpartisan commission show that of the total of our stupendous manufactures 97 per cent are sold in our magnificent home market, leaving only 3 per cent to be sold abroad. These statistics further show that of the 3 per cent sold abroad as much as 90 per cent are sold at as high and sometimes at higher prices than those that are sold at home. So that after all you have the insignificant sum of 10 per cent of 3 per cent of goods sold abroad at lower prices than they are sold at home. Three-tenths of 1 per cent is the sum and substance of the whole of what all this controversy is about. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, Senator GALLINGER, who made a careful examination of this subject—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will it interrupt the gentleman if I ask him three questions? The gentleman's

position, as I understand it, is that we do sell abroad at a lower price than we sell here.

Mr. DALZELL. Some things.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And that that is justifiable? Now, if that is true, then those Republican orators who have asserted that we do not sell abroad cheaper than we do at home did not know what they were talking about. Isn't that true?

Mr. DALZELL. I think they made a mistake, if they so asserted, to the extent which I have stated here.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Then, if your conclusions are correct, are not the conclusions of my friend from Ohio, General GROSVENOR, and my friend from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL] and my friend from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] incorrect when they say that we only sell shop-worn and obsolete goods cheaper in Europe than we are selling them at home?

Mr. DALZELL. Well, I do not know whether they said that or not.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL] said that in that famous speech of his—

Mr. DALZELL. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL] is of age. Ask him.

Mr. BOUTELL. The gentleman from Missouri is stating a newspaper account of what I said instead of the words which I used. I made no such statement, I thought no such thing, and such, so far as I know, is not the fact.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, I will prove it by the RECORD, unless you change the RECORD.

Mr. PAYNE. I hope the gentleman when he proves that will also prove, if I may be allowed to interrupt, that the famous Tom Johnson voted against the Wilson bill as it went from the House, as the gentleman from Missouri asserted two weeks ago, amid a storm of Democratic applause.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not want to take the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but I will state in one sentence what Tom Johnson did. He voted for the Wilson bill as it left the House, and against the Wilson bill as it was reported back here from the Senate.

Mr. PAYNE. That is exactly what I said, and the gentleman denied in a loud voice, amid Democratic applause, that that was so.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There was so much noise that nobody could tell what either one of us said.

Mr. PAYNE. It shows how the gentleman goes wrong so often.

Mr. DALZELL. I was going on to say that Senator GALLINGER made a thorough examination of this subject, and in a speech made on the floor of the Senate on the 23d day of April last he placed the value of exports sold at a lower price abroad than at home at \$4,000,000, and said:

I can not find that the substantial correctness of this estimate has ever been questioned by the opposition.

And I want to say that I have never heard the substantial correctness of this statement questioned except by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], who said that *he did not believe it*.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. DALZELL. Yes.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Thomas R. Phillips was a member of this commission, was he not?

Mr. DALZELL. Yes; I believe he was.

Mr. HARDWICK. Did he not, by a supplemental report, although he was a Republican, say that out of two thousand letters of inquiry on this subject about export prices, only 416 had been answered, and that it was fair to conclude that the majority of those people who did not answer, they being usually large corporations charged with this practice, would have returned unfavorable answers if they had replied, and did he not attack very severely the suggestion which the gentleman has just made, namely, that three-tenths of 1 per cent is a fair estimate of the amount of this business?

Mr. DALZELL. I know that Mr. Phillips was a member of that commission, and I know he was not in harmony with the result obtained by the commission. He was a minority member. As to the other things, I do not know, and I am willing to take the statement of the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. HARDWICK. I will put it in the RECORD.

Mr. DALZELL. I was proceeding to say, when interrupted that I have never heard the substantial correctness of Senator GALLINGER's estimate questioned except by the gentleman from Mississippi, who says that "he does not believe it." I trust that I violate no decorum of debate when I say that the belief of the gentleman from Mississippi is of mighty little consequence, against the conclusions founded upon evidence, of those who have examined, and who were competent to examine, the subject.

I want to say, as others have said before, that if we sold all of our three per cent of surplus abroad at a less price than we sell it at home, instead of selling three-tenths of one per cent at a lower price, we could better afford to throw the whole surplus into the Atlantic, rather than close up our factories and turn our men to idleness. [Applause on the Republican side.] And I want to say further that there is not a dollar's worth of American product sold in a foreign market at any price that is not the result of the labor of an American workman, who was paid an American wage. [Applause.]

I want to say, further, that it is the very mystery of mysteries to me that partisan bigotry and rancor should assault those, whether corporations or individuals, who, with characteristic American enterprise, are attempting to conquer foreign markets. [Applause on the Republican side.] It is the very infamy of demagoguery to misrepresent them, but they will not suffer, for behind them is the great body of patriotic people who glory in and encourage American pluck and believe in its ultimate triumph. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, I want to address myself to what was said by the gentleman from Mississippi in his speech made on this floor and published in the RECORD on the 3d of May last. There is not a single one of these witnesses whose testimony I am about to examine whose testimony relates to the question as to the extent of our sales abroad. There is not a single one of them who professed to know anything, of his own knowledge, on the subject of sales abroad, with one exception.

I quote from the speech of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. What I read is taken from the report of the testimony before the Merchant Marine Commission, volume 3, page 77, and here is the colloquy:

Senator MALLORY. There is another question. Some years ago we were shipping steel plate to the Clyde. As I remember, we had some very good evidence to that effect before Congress. Quite a large contract was made, and it was said that we were underselling the British steel-plate makers on their own ground. Do you remember whether or not that was correct? That was about four or five years ago.

Mr. NIXON. I heard the statement at the time. I have no doubt that some contracts were placed in this country. I merely had to take the statement as I saw it printed. I had no connection with it.

That is one of the gentleman's witnesses to prove conclusively that our sales, not as a dumping project, as an excuse or an alternative, but as a custom—that is, one of the witnesses upon whom the gentleman relies to prove that custom, a gentleman who says that of *his own personal knowledge he knows nothing*.

Now, the next witness was Mr. A. A. Moss. What did he say? He said:

I believe that the steel trust is responsible to a great extent in discriminating against the American shipbuilder in the way of prices, as plates and other material made by the American steel trust are shipped to England and sold at 25 to 33 per cent less than they can be had in this country.

So, the gentleman *believes*, but he does not pretend to testify of his own knowledge; he also is testifying from hearsay. The next witness was Mr. McGregor, and I was glad to hear the gentleman from Mississippi say that that testimony had been gathered for him by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GILLESPIE], because I know that if the gentleman from Mississippi had himself read the testimony he would not have been responsible for its indorsement in the RECORD.

Mr. McGregor says:

I picked up a newspaper in the month of February and read a piece of news that one of the independent steel companies, not in the trust, in Pennsylvania, had just sold 40,000 tons of steel rails to the Canadian Pacific Railroad at \$21.50 a ton.

So far, you see, he is only a witness to a newspaper paragraph. He continued:

You remember when Congressman Johnson was in the House he made a statement as steel manufacturer that he could make steel rails at a profit of \$2 a ton and deliver them on the cars at Johnstown, at the Cambria Works, at \$18.50 a ton. That statement is on record in Congress and is not disputed. Oh, they did contradict him, but the question here in issue, gentlemen, is, Did they successfully contradict him? because he was at that time one of the largest manufacturers of steel and iron in the United States, and as a manufacturer of steel and iron he simply took his books and showed that he paid higher wages than any concern in the trust, and he was then a member of the steel trust. These are the facts on record.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FLOOD and Mr. CLARK of Missouri both asked that the gentleman from Pennsylvania be allowed to conclude his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the gentleman be allowed to conclude his remarks. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. DALZELL. If the gentleman from Mississippi had read the testimony he would have found that Mr. McGregor was a man who knew nothing about the steel business; that he was a walking delegate who appeared before the committee in

the interest, as he said, of the laboring man, and he proved, but not, I fear, to the satisfaction of the chairman of the committee, that you could make steel for \$4 or \$5 a ton! So far as Tom Johnson is concerned, he did not say any such thing as the witness testifies to.

I shall have occasion to call attention a little later to what Tom Johnson did say as a manufacturer of steel and iron and the cost of their production. Tom Johnson, however, specifically denied that he was a member of the trust. He did not show his books to prove that he was paying the highest wages. On the contrary it was proven on him here that he compelled his men to take their wages one-third in cash and two-thirds in scrip or cease work. On this floor he made the assertion that that scrip was taken up at a premium. He then revised that statement out of the RECORD and put in its place in the RECORD the next day that the scrip had been lifted at par. I proved, as the RECORD will show, that it had been bought up on the street by one of Tom Johnson's relatives at a discount, thereby showing how he was cheating his own workmen. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] So much for three of the gentleman's witnesses. Now, then, the other witness is a man of some character, Mr. Wallace.

Mr. Wallace says:

Recently one of our largest steel mills sold abroad 100,000 tons of steel plate. They delivered it, I understand, at Belfast at \$24 per ton. That would practically mean, with ocean rates as they are, \$22 a ton at tide water. They are charging to-day at Pittsburgh \$32 per ton. About four years ago our company took a contract from the American Navigation Company for building here on the lakes two 7,000-ton ships, etc.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I want to know who bought the steel you speak of.

Mr. WALLACE. The Harland & Wolfe Company.

Further along he testifies that it was sold by the United States Steel Corporation. Now, you have the testimony of Mr. Wallace that those 100,000 tons of steel plate were sold, that they were sold to a certain party, and that they were sold by the United States Steel Corporation, and he gives that testimony upon the responsibility of another party, who, he says, told him so. I take it that any lawyer will agree that the hearsay testimony of Mr. Wallace may be offset by the testimony of a man who speaks of knowledge, and such man was Mr. Gary, the chairman of the executive board of the United States Steel Corporation. Mr. Gary was asked to make a statement before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and he said:

I have no particular statement to make. I am not here to advocate any particular business or any particular proposition. I am quite ready to give such information as I have that is pertinent to the inquiry. Perhaps I ought to refer specifically to a statement made by Mr. Wallace, of Cleveland, Ohio, president of the American Ship-building Company, in which he says—

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. That is in the hearings before the Merchant Marine Commission?

Mr. GARY. Yes; you know better than I what it is. It is the report of the Merchant Marine Commission of the testimony taken at the hearings, Volume II, page 811. I quote from his testimony:

"Recently one of our largest steel mills sold abroad 100,000 tons of steel plate. They delivered it, I understand, at Belfast at \$24 a ton."

On the next page there is this question by Representative Grosvenor: "Q. I want to know who bought the steel plate you speak of?—A. The Harland & Wolfe Company, Belfast."

"Q. From whom did they buy it? A. The United States Steel Corporation."

I notice that Mr. Wallace apparently speaks from information. If he had such information it was entirely unreliable. The statement is not founded in fact. The companies in which we are interested sold no ship plate in 1905 to Europe, only a little over 3,000 tons in 1904, not any in 1903, and I think not any in 1902.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. To whom did they sell, Judge, in 1904?

Mr. GARY. We sold a little over 3,000 tons; I think it was in small, scattering lots.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Not in a lump?

Mr. GARY. No. Now, as a matter of fact, the export prices of ship plate at the present time are nearly equal to the domestic prices; and that is true of most of the commodities produced by our corporations. It is also a fact that the domestic prices of the manufacturers of the steel-producing countries are generally higher than our domestic prices, or the domestic prices of the manufacturers of this country. It is also true that the export prices of the manufacturers in foreign steel-producing countries are about the same as the export prices of the manufacturers of this country. It is a fact, however, that it is the policy of manufacturers generally throughout the world to sell at times a limited portion of their output for export at prices lower than the domestic prices.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. And that rule prevails everywhere?

Mr. GARY. Everywhere. The particular reason for that is well understood. It is for the interest, I think, of the domestic producer at times to have surplus commodities sold for export at prices lower than the domestic price, for the total result is to reduce the price to the domestic consumer. It is well understood in manufacturing circles that the manufacturing cost of factory products is materially less if the factories are operated to their full capacity. Therefore the manufacturer seeks to keep his mills fully employed, in full operation. He does that for two reasons: First, to produce at the lowest cost, and, second, to keep all of his employees fully employed all the time. Sometimes, in order to keep his mills fully employed, there is a surplus product; the product is larger than the domestic consumers will take. That surplus is sold for export wherever it can be sold. The foreign country in those cases has been termed a "dumping ground."

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. And you have to sell at a price that will meet the market, or you can not dispose of the stock there?

Mr. GARY. Of course if you sell abroad you must meet the market

there. At the present time, however, the prices, as I have said, are pretty nearly alike.

In connection with Mr. Gary's testimony I submit herewith a table which he put in evidence, being a comparison of the f. o. b. mill prices, domestic and export, on iron and steel in the principal producing countries of the world.

Comparison of present f. o. b. mill prices, domestic and export, on iron and steel in the principal producing countries.

Country.	Rails.		Billets.		Structural, including bars, shapes, plates, angles, and tees.	
	Home price.	Export price.	Home price.	Export price.	Home price.	Export price.
Great Britain.....	\$31.50	\$25.00	\$24.00	\$1.60	\$1.35
Canada.....	33.00	33.00
Germany.....	30.00	24.00	27.00	\$20.00	1.50	1.25
France.....	31.00	25.50	27.00	20.50	1.65	1.45
Austria-Hungary.....	31.00	25.50	27.00	22.00	1.50	1.35
Belgium.....	30.00	24.00	27.00	19.50	1.55	1.35
United States.....	28.00	25.00	24.00	21.00	1.60	1.40
		to	to		to	to
		26.50	27.00		1.70	1.50

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] does not know a single one of the four witnesses to whose testimony he made reference. He does not personally know one of them. He does not know Mr. Gary and yet he indorses and gives credence to the three gentlemen who testify not of their own knowledge but upon hearsay and refuses to give credence to Mr. Gary. Why? Because he is connected with what the gentleman from Mississippi is pleased to call a trust, and the gentleman from Mississippi went so far, although he somewhat modified it in the RECORD, as to insinuate that Mr. Gary was guilty of a falsehood.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Gary is one of those men whose lives illustrate the possibilities of American citizenship. A graduate of the common schools and of the University of Chicago, by sheer force of character and capacity he has attained to his present position as chief executive officer of the greatest industrial corporation in the world. In all the communities in which he has ever moved he has been a man honored by his fellows. He is a trustee of the Northwestern University. For two terms he was mayor of his native town. For twenty-five years he was a prominent member of the Chicago bar, and for a term president of the Chicago Bar Association. For two terms he was an honored judge upon the bench. He is as clean a man as any in this House. It will take more than the slurs of the gentleman from Mississippi to assail the character, the competency, or the veracity of Mr. Gary. His testimony was so destructive to the case of the gentleman from Mississippi that he declined to have it go into the RECORD. I need not say more. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, the practice of selling cheaper in the export market than in the home market is in conformity with that of every nation which makes goods to sell. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] the other day put into the RECORD proofs of this fact from standard publications.

I do not propose to add to that character of testimony, but I do submit to you testimony from recognized industrial journals of the world upon that subject. I have here—and I am not going to stop to read them at length, because I am occupying much more time than I wanted to—extracts from leading trades journals giving the home and export prices of foreign countries for basic steel bars, joists, and Bessemer steel rails, and other things, showing the wide difference between the home and the export prices. I insert them as follows:

From London Iron and Coal Trades Review, February 9, 1906, giving German home and export prices for basic steel bars, joists, and Bessemer steel rails, showing a wide difference between the home and export prices, especially for steel rails, the latter being quoted at 135 shillings for home consumption and 115 shillings for export, a difference of 20 shillings, or about \$5:

The council of the steel syndicate have now by a majority of votes sanctioned an increase in the allotments for bar iron and plates by 5 per cent, and in rolled rods by 10 per cent. Since the beginning of the syndicate's operations the advance in plates and sheets has consequently been 15 per cent, bars 10 per cent, and rolled rods 10 per cent by a single stroke. As far as bars are concerned, it appears that the augmentation is due, firstly, to the large demand experienced from the export market, and, secondly, to the increasing bar exports of Belgium. Yet all the German syndicated works have not in sales reached the full total of the allotments obtaining previous to the decision to make the fresh advance.

It is understood, in connection with the international arrangement in respect of wire nails, that the Belgian and Swiss makers have given their adhesion to the agreement for the current half year. The German wire-nail syndicate intends to make endeavors to convert into a

binding agreement the international understanding which was arrived at in Paris two or three months ago.

The inland prices in Westphalia are as follows: German foundry pig, No. 1, 78s.; German foundry pig, No. 3, 70s.; hematite, 82s.; white forge pig, at Siegen, 65s.; basic pig, 68s. to 68s. 6d.; Lorraine-Luxemburg foundry pig, No. 3, 62s., at Luxemburg; German Bessemer iron, 82s.; spiegeleisen, 93s.; English foundry pig, No. 3, 72s., duty paid at Duisburg; malleable-iron bars, 142s. to 145s.; basic steel bars, 120s. to 125s.; basic steel angles, 115s. to 120s.; joists, 120s. to 122s. 6d.; basic steel plates, No. 1, 145s. to 150s.; open-hearth plates, No. 1, 160s., and No. 2, 145s. to 150s., and Bessemer steel rails, 135s. per ton at the works. The inland prices remain on the basis of existing contracts at 82s. 6d. for ingots, 92s. 6d. for blooms, 95s. for billets, and 97s. 6d. for sheet bars, all of basic steel. Open-hearth is 5s. per ton higher.

The export prices are undernoted: Steel blooms, 95s. to 96s. c. i. f.; steel billets, 97s. to 98s. c. i. f.; steel sheet bars, 90s. to 100s. c. i. f.; basic bars, £5 15s. to £6 f. o. b.; steel joists, 105s. f. o. b.; steel rails (heavy section), 115 f. o. b.; iron bars, No. 2, £5 18s. to £6 2s. f. o. b.; iron angles, £6 to £6 4s. f. o. b.

London Iron and Coal Trades Review, February 16, 1906, showing home and export prices in Belgian iron and steel market.

	Iron No. 2, hometrade, per 1,000 kilos f. o. t. at buyer's station.		Exports per 2,240 pounds d/d f. o. b. Antwerp.	
	French currency.	United States currency.	English currency.	United States currency.
Iron No. 2:	Francs.		£ s. d.	
Bars.....	157.50	\$30.40	5 18 0	\$28.71
Angles.....	160.00	30.88	6 0 0	29.19
Tees.....	167.50	32.32	6 4 0	30.17
Rods.....	175.00	33.77	6 15 0	32.85
Plates.....	165.00	31.84	6 8 0	31.15
Basic steel:				
Bars.....	155.00	29.91	5 15 0	28.47
Angles.....	155.00	29.91	5 17 0	28.47
Tees.....	165.00	31.84	6 15 0	32.85
Plates 3/4-inch and thicker.	162.50	31.36	6 4 0	30.17

This same table appears again in the London Iron and Coal Trades Review of February 23, 1906.

Also the following from the same journal:

	Home price.		Foreign.	
	French currency.	U. S. currency.	English currency.	U. S. currency.
Ingot.....	Francs. 112.50	\$21.72	Nominal.	
Blooms.....	125.00	24.12	£ s. d. 0 89 6	\$21.75
Billets.....	130.00	25.10	0 91 6	22.23
Sheet bars.....	135.00	26.05	0 93 6	22.72

Also, from same journal, February 16, 1906: "Joists for home consumption quiet, but the demand for exports keeps very brisk."

	Home price.		Foreign.	
	French currency.	U. S. currency.	English currency.	U. S. currency.
Joists.....	Francs. 142.50	\$27.50	£ s. d. 5 5 0	\$25.55

See Review, February 9, 1906, page 457, for "Inland prices in Westphalia and export prices." Also, *ibid*, January 26, 1906, page 286.

From London Iron and Coal Trades Review, February 23, 1906, showing home and export prices in the Belgian iron and steel market:

Makers of semifinished steel are extremely active, and our steel works find it difficult to keep pace with the deliveries asked for on specifications. Some large transactions in billets for export to England have taken place early this month, but during the last week a certain insecurity has taken buyers off the market, who are for the present keeping off so far as they can. Fresh business in the home trade is equally quiet. Nevertheless, prices are keeping firm, and we quote:

	Hometrade, per 1,000 kilos, f. o. t. at buyer's station.		Export, per 2,240 pounds d/d f. o. b. Antwerp.	
	French currency.	United States currency.	English currency.	United States currency.
Ingot.....	Francs. 112.50	\$21.72	Nominal.	
Blooms.....	125	24.12	89 6	\$21.75
Billets.....	130	25.10	91 6	22.23
Sheet bars.....	135	26.05	93 6	22.72

Certain irregularity exists in finished bars, but on the whole business continues good. Perhaps, in the heavier sizes, specifications could be more plentiful. Sheet iron is firm, and rods enjoy a favorable position. Exports to China and Japan are very low, and it will most likely take the Japanese some time yet to recover from the effects of the recent war. Some inquiries are in the market for the Manchurias, and our makers hope to be successful with their tenders.

Business with South Africa is still discouraging, and no orders of any magnitude will be coming forward till the new government has pronounced itself as to the labor question. South America has been quiet this month, and will most likely be so for some five or six weeks yet, but houses interested in this trade hold out for good business. Our trade with Australia is expanding. Prices for finished material run about as follows:

	Home trade, per 1,000 kilos, f. o. t. at buyer's station.		Export, per 2,240 pounds, d/d f. o. b. Antwerp.	
	French currency.	United States currency.	English currency.	United States currency.
Iron No. 2:	Francs.		£ s. d.	
Bars.....	157.50	\$30.40	5 18 0	\$28.71
Angles.....	160.00	30.88	6 0 0	29.19
Tees.....	167.50	32.32	6 4 0	30.17
Rods.....	175.00	33.77	6 15 0	32.85
Plates.....	165.00	31.84	6 8 0	31.15
Iron No. 3 Bars.....	162.50	31.36	2 0	
Basic steel:				
Bars.....	155.00	29.91	5 15 0	28.47
Angles.....	155.00	29.91	5 17 0	28.47
Tees.....	165.00	31.84	6 15 0	32.85
Rods.....	175.00	33.77	6 15 0	32.85
Plates, 3/4 inch and thicker.	162.50	31.36	6 4 0	30.17
Bulb tee fencing standards for the cape.....			6 2 6	29.80

I have also an extract from a consular report, which relates to the same subject:

NORWAY'S PAPER INDUSTRY.

Consul-General Bordewich reports from Christiania that the export of paper from Norway is gradually increasing. The exports for which official figures are given were in value \$2,179,000 in 1899 and \$2,817,000 in 1904. Official figures for 1905 are not as yet available, but if recent newspaper articles can be relied upon the export for that year was larger than for any previous year. The countries to which the largest exports were made in 1904 were Great Britain, Germany, and Holland. The finer grades of writing and bond paper are imported from Germany, England, the United States, and Belgium.

Germany is Norway's most formidable European competitor in paper production. The larger German mills have formed a syndicate, whose object it is to control the yearly production of paper and to regulate prices and output. It is claimed by Norwegian paper manufacturers that the prices charged by the Germans for export goods are from 10 to 15 per cent lower than the prices charged in the home market. Two new paper mills were built in Norway in 1905. The Norwegian paper manufacturers depend on their splendid water powers, easy access to timber, and low wages paid employees for ability to meet competition and continue their business with profits. Some of their wrapping papers are now finding a limited but increasing market even in America.

Now, with respect to England. In 1816 Lord Brougham, in a speech in Parliament advocating the increased exportation of British goods to the United States, declared that—

It was well worth while to incur a loss upon the first exportation in order by the glut to stifle in the cradle those rising manufactures in the United States which the war has forced into existence contrary to the natural course of things.

And any man who knows anything about American history knows that our tariff was born of England's attempt to crush out our colonial manufactures. Why the State of Pennsylvania has on her statute books a protective law passed long before the adoption of the American Constitution. [Applause on the Republican side.] In 1854 a British parliamentary commission reported as follows:

The laboring classes generally in the manufacturing districts of this country, and especially in the iron and coal districts, are very little aware of the extent to which they are often indebted for their being employed at all to the immense losses which their employers voluntarily incur in bad times in order to destroy foreign competition and to gain and to keep possession of foreign markets. The large capitals of this country are the great instruments of warfare against the competing capital of foreign countries and the most essential instruments now remaining by which our manufacturing supremacy can be maintained.

So much for the English Parliament. In the "Second report of the royal commission appointed to inquire into the question of trade and industry, presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of Her Majesty," you will find the testimony of Sir Lothian Bell, president of the British Iron and Steel Association, as to the existence of a steel-rail trust participated in by the British and German manufacturers of steel rails, and the testimony to the same effect of others, including that of Mr. I. G. Smith, general manager of the Barrow Hematite Steel Company. These gentlemen bear witness to a putting down of prices to foreign buyers and to the putting up of prices to

home consumers, and say it was their purpose to seize the American markets by selling rails there at less than cost and reimbursing their loss by a raise of price in the home market. It is matter of common knowledge to every person engaged in the trade that certain English goods are sold in the New York market at lower prices than the same goods are sold for in England.

Now, I have shown you by competent testimony, by testimony that would be admissible in any court, and unless rebutted would be conclusive, that this is a universal business custom indulged in by all trading nations, free trade nations or protective. The custom prevails in England, as I have shown you.

I say this is a wise policy. In the great commercial war in which all nations are now engaged, if we would gain a foothold in foreign markets we must compete with foreign prices. I recall vividly an instance in point, and I have no doubt many of you do also. A few years ago we had in this House discussion over the question of the price of armor plate.

It turned out in that discussion that the Bethlehem Steel Company, of Pennsylvania, conceded that it had sold a lot of armor abroad at a less price than it was asking the United States for it. And it defended its action upon two grounds. First and foremost, upon the ground that it was necessary if they would keep their works in operation and their men at work, and, secondly, on the ground that they were desirous of securing a market for their armor plate abroad. Now, what has been the result? The result has been that we are getting armor plate in the United States to-day at a less price than any other country in the world, and that within the last ten years we have constructed no small number of Russian and Japanese battle ships, all of which have been covered with armor made by the Bethlehem Steel Company, in Pennsylvania, and sold to Russia and Japan at a higher price than the same article is sold for to the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.]

It is the workingmen who have been the beneficiaries of that policy, and it is only necessary that you should take the statistics of our exports to ascertain to what extent in the line of various manufactures by the pursuit of this policy we have already established ourselves in foreign markets.

It is not only a wise policy, but it is a necessary one. In this same commercial contest to which I have referred we go out to meet foreign tariffs, foreign syndicates, cartels, bounties, all of which were made for the purpose of excluding us from the foreign markets. I am not going to weary you by reading to you all of the proof. I will put it in the Record. It is as follows:

I read from the report of Frank H. Mason, our consul-general at Berlin, made in the fall of 1902:

Much of the iron and steel exported from Germany during the past year has been sold on the basis of a clearing-out sale, for what it would bring and for prices which yielded little, if any, profit to the exporters. However, the large export served to clear out accumulated stocks, and by keeping the mills and workmen measurably employed, helped to palliate some of the worst effects of the crisis. So timely was the relief thus obtained that a powerful special syndicate was formed during the summer of 1902 for the purpose of paying bounties on exports of iron and steel. This combination includes the coal, coke, pig iron, and semiproduct syndicates, the Wire Drawers' Association, and the syndicates of sheet metal, girders, and structural iron, respectively, and has its central office at Cologne. The purpose of the combination is to pay to such of its members as export all or part of their product a bonus equal to the difference between the current price of the merchandise in the German market and the price actually obtained for it abroad; in other words, to sustain exports at the expense of the home consumers of steel and iron.

It was shown in evidence produced before a court at Godesberg that the coke syndicate had sold to three large iron companies in Austria blast-furnace coke for \$1.97 per ton, while the price to German furnace men was held stiff at 17 marks (\$4.04), or more than double the export rate. The girder syndicate mills charged with having taken foreign orders at from 89 to 92 marks (\$21.18 to \$21.89) per ton, while maintaining a home rate of 120 marks (\$28.56). The rail syndicate sold rails abroad for 30 marks (\$7.14) per ton below the inland price, the wire mills cut their home rate of 150 marks (\$35.70) down to 105 marks (\$25) for export, and the rollers of plates and other shipbuilding material pursued a similar policy until the shipbuilders of the Lower Rhine made formal complaint that they could not compete with the Dutch and Belgian shipyards which derived their metal supplies from Germany. Whatever may be the result, the fact is that the industries of Germany are now more thoroughly and largely syndicated than ever before, and a movement is taking shape to provide a system of closer and more exacting Government supervision over such combinations.

Then only a few days ago, April 9, Joseph J. Brittain, the American consul at Kehl, Germany, said:

German chambers of commerce work hand in hand with the export. The German railroads, which are owned by the Government, give foreign exports the right of way, and in some instances special rates. Ships owned by the Germans and sailing from German ports carry German goods to their destination.

And so from the consular reports of Consul Winter and Consul Guenther.

FORMATION OF TRUSTS IN GERMANY.

Consul Winter, writing from Annaberg, Germany, says the record of corporate organization in Germany was as follows for the several years named:

Year.	Companies.	Capital.	Average.
1898	329	\$110,341,560	\$333,200
1899	364	123,564,820	354,620
1900	261	81,029,480	309,400
1901	158	37,563,500	242,760
1902	87	28,210,140	323,680
1903	84	71,409,520	749,680
1904	104	33,474,700	321,300

In 1903 the great iron and steel firm of Friedrich Krupp, at Essen, was converted into a stock company, with a capital of \$38,080,000, or more than half of the entire new stock capital of that year. This accounts for the seeming paradox in the figures for 1903 and 1904. The most important and striking tendency manifested by incorporated interests in Germany during the past five years has been that of combination into variously named organizations to control competition, limit and allot production, and to maintain home prices while strengthening the more important interests for aggressive competition in foreign markets. (From Daily Consular Trade Reports, August 9, 1905.)

INVESTIGATING GERMAN TRUSTS.

For some years past the Federal Government has had a permanent commission engaged in investigating German industries, and the influence of the trusts and syndicates thereupon. The commission has accumulated a vast amount of information, but nothing has been published thus far concerning its views. Apparently it is undecided whether combines influence German industries and export trade beneficially or otherwise. It is said that an investigation of the tin-plate and steel trusts will now be undertaken. Some German papers are expressing their impatience at the silence of the commission as regarding governmental action. Complaints come from many industries that the trusts and syndicates sell their products to foreign manufacturers at much lower prices than they compel German industries to pay, thus benefiting foreign competition and injuring German exports of manufactured articles where labor forms the principal item of cost. (Richard Guenther, consul-general, Frankfurt, Germany, June 8, 1905.)

MANUFACTURING COMBINES.

Consul-General Guenther reports that a short time ago the leading German manufacturers of derricks convened at Frankfurt and resolved to combine with the Association of German Machine Works for the purpose of protecting their trade interests and to establish uniform terms and rates in conducting the business of that branch of manufacture. The plush manufacturers of France aim to establish a trade league for the purpose of regulating prices of their products, terms of sale, etc. They invited the German plush manufacturers to their convention, which was held at Paris on November 18, and the latter accepted. The movement for financial and manufacturing combines and fusions is still going on in the countries of continental Europe. (From Daily Consular and Trade Reports, January 11, 1906.)

And here I call your attention to a somewhat startling fact. Even Japan has taken a hand in organizing syndicates to keep her home market. I read from Consular and Trade Reports:

Thus we find in the case of contending business concerns the force and power of the Government in recommending a combination of interests, to the end that all may live and the industry prosper from concentrated effort. This we find exemplified in the recent combination of the various watch-making concerns. The Government, viewing the warring competitors, steps in and advises the formation of a trust. The business is put under the license system, and the Government promises in consideration of the combination the issuance of an imperial license, which virtually shuts off competition, and incidentally puts the industry directly under the control of the Government.

And then I submit extracts from the Statistical Yearbook of Canada for 1904, showing the bounty paid by Canada on all kinds of iron and steel, and the amounts paid.

CANADIAN BOUNTIES.

[Extracts from "The Statistical Yearbook of Canada 1904," pages 185 and 186.]

The Dominion Parliament, in 1883, authorized the payment of a bounty of \$1.50 a ton upon all pig iron manufactured in Canada. This bounty was continued until 1st July, 1889, when the rate was made \$1 a ton. A further change was made on 1st July, 1892, when the rate was increased to \$2 a ton until 1st July, 1897.

In the session of 1894 an act was passed providing that the governor in council may authorize the payment of a bounty of \$2 per ton on all pig iron made in Canada from Canadian ore, or a bounty of \$2 per ton on all puddled bars made in Canada from Canadian pig iron made from Canadian ore, and a bounty of \$2 per ton on all steel billets manufactured in Canada from Canadian pig iron and such other ingredients as are necessary and usual in the manufacture of steel billets. These bounties were applicable till March 26, 1899, in the case of furnaces in operation on March 27, 1894, and in the case of furnaces commencing operations subsequent to that date, but before March 27, 1899, for five years from the date of commencing.

This act was repealed by chapter 6 of the acts of 1897, which authorized the governor-general to give (1) a bounty of \$3 per ton on steel ingots manufactured from ingredients of which not less than 50 per cent of their weight consists of pig iron made in Canada; (2) a bounty of \$3 per ton on puddled iron bars made from Canadian-made pig iron; (3) a bounty on pig iron manufactured from ore of \$3 per ton on the proportion produced from Canadian ore, and \$2 on the proportion produced from foreign ore.

An act of 1898 provides that the provisions of the act are to be held to have come into force on April 23, 1897. An act of 1899 limited the time and provided for a yearly diminishing rate of bounty. The act of 1903 provided for the payment of bounties on rolled wire rods (\$6 per ton), other rolled shapes (\$3), and rolled plates (\$3), the articles to be manufactured in Canada from steel produced in Canada from

Ingredients of which not less than 50 per cent consisted of pig iron made in Canada. The act further provides that the bounties for 1903-4 shall be 90 per cent of the amount fixed by chapter 6, acts 1897, 75 per cent in 1904-5, 55 per cent in 1905-6, and 35 per cent in 1906-7.

The legislature of Ontario passed an act in the session of 1894 appropriating the sum of \$125,000, to be known as the iron-mining fund. Out of this fund the treasurer was authorized to pay \$1 per ton of pig-metal product on iron ores raised or mined and smelted in the Province of Ontario, the amount so paid not to exceed in any one year \$25,000. This fund has been exhausted by the payments made for the bounty year ended October 31, 1904.

The annual consumption of iron and steel and their products in Canada is between 800,000 tons and 820,000 tons.

[Extract from The Statistical Yearbook of Canada—1894, page 189.]

Following are the amounts which have been paid under the Federal parliamentary authorization on pig iron:

Fiscal year.	Amount.	Bounty paid per ton.	Fiscal year.	Amount.	Bounty paid per ton.
1884	\$44,090	\$1.50	1895	\$63,384	\$2.00
1885	38,655	1.50	1896	104,105	2.00
1886	39,270	1.50	1897	65,509	2.00
1887	59,576	1.50	1898	165,654	(a)
1888	33,314	1.50	1899	187,954	(a)
1889	37,234	1.50	1900	238,256	(a)
1890	25,697	1.00	1901	351,259	(a)
1891	20,153	1.00	1902	693,109	(a)
1892	30,294	1.00	1903	670,340	(a)
1893	93,836	2.00	1904	533,983	(a)
1894	125,044	2.00			

* Three dollars per ton on pig iron made from Canadian ore, and \$2 per ton on pig iron made from foreign ore up to April 23, 1902; from April 23, 1902, to June 30, 1904, \$2.70 and \$1.80 per ton; from July 1, 1904, to June 30, 1905, \$2.25 and \$1.50 per ton; from July 1, 1905, to June 30, 1906, \$1.65 and \$1.10 per ton; from July 1, 1906, to June 30, 1907, \$1.05 and 70 cents per ton.

[Extract from The Statistical Yearbook of Canada, 1904, page 189.]

Statements of the quantities and amount of bounty paid on steel ingots, steel billets, and puddled bars, 1896-1904.

Year ended June 30—	Steel ingots.			Puddled bars.		
	Quantity.	Bounty paid.	Bounty earned.	Quantity.	Bounty paid.	Bounty earned.
1896				2,806	\$5,611	
1897	18,137	\$54,412		1,509	3,019	
1898	24,881	74,644		2,615	7,706	
1899	21,453	64,360		5,837	17,511	
1900	33,352	100,058		3,374	10,121	
1901	64,445	185,509		5,568	16,703	
1902	232,641	620,731		6,984	17,710	\$20,549
1903	130,440	347,990		2,482	9,541	6,702
1904				4,322	11,669	

NOTE.—No bounty paid on steel billets after June 30, 1897. The number of tons manufactured during 1896-97 was 43,344, and the bounty paid amounted to \$89,006.

[Extract from The Statistical Yearbook of Canada, 1904, page 190.]

Statement of bounties paid on articles manufactured from steel, 1904.

	Quantity.	Amount.	Bounty paid per ton.
	Tons.		
Rolled round steel wire rods	895.44	\$5,373	\$6.00
Rolled angles	3,290.96	9,873	6.00
Rolled plates	25.11	75	3.00
Total	4,211.51	15,321	

I also submit the following furnished by the Treasury Department taken from the statistics of the Dominion Iron Trade for 1901.

CANADIAN BOUNTIES ON IRON AND STEEL.

As has been heretofore explained, the recent rapid development of the iron and steel industries of Canada has been greatly promoted by the action of the Dominion parliament in enacting the bounty act of June 29, 1897. But the bounty system had previously been in force in Canada. In 1883 the Dominion parliament authorized the payment of a bounty of \$1.50 a ton on all pig iron manufactured in Canada. This bounty was continued until July 1, 1899, when the rate was made \$1 a ton. A further change was made on July 1, 1899, when the rate was increased to \$2 a ton until July 1, 1897, and in 1894 additional legislation provided for the payment of a bounty of \$2 a ton on puddled bars and on steel billets.

The act of 1897, most fruitful of all, provided for the payment of \$3 per ton "on steel ingots manufactured from ingredients of which not less than 50 per cent of the weight thereof consists of pig iron made in Canada;" \$3 per ton "on puddled iron bars manufactured from pig iron made in Canada;" \$3 per ton "on pig iron on the proportion produced from Canada ore," and \$2 per ton "on pig iron on the proportion produced from foreign ore." These bounties have been extended to June 30, 1907; provided, however, that they shall be annually reduced after April 23, 1902, as follows: From that date to June 30, 1903, 90 per cent shall be paid; from July 1, 1903, to June 30, 1904, 75 per cent; from July 1, 1904, to June 30, 1905, 55 per cent; from July 1, 1905, to June 30, 1906, 35 per cent; from July 1, 1906, to June 30, 1907, 20 per cent.

Down to June 30, 1901, there had been paid in iron and steel

bounties under the foregoing acts a total of \$2,168,435. In addition to these payments the Province of Ontario has paid since 1894 a bounty of \$1 a ton on all pig iron made in the Province from iron ore mined in Ontario. To October 31, 1901, there had been paid under this legislation \$59,741.

The following details of the payments of bounty by the Dominion government from 1884 to 1901 are copied from the Statistical Yearbook of Canada for 1901, for a copy of which the writer is indebted to the courtesy of the Hon. George Johnson, statistician of the Dominion department of agriculture.

In the following table are the amounts which have been paid under the Federal parliamentary authorization:

Bounties paid by the Canadian government on iron and steel from 1884 to 1901, inclusive.

Fiscal year.	Total amount.	Amount per ton.	Fiscal year.	Total amount.	Amount per ton.
1884	\$44,090	\$1.50	1893	\$93,896	\$2.00
1885	38,655	1.50	1894	125,044	2.00
1886	39,270	1.50	1895	63,384	2.00
1887	59,576	1.50	1896	104,105	2.00
1888	33,314	1.50	1897	65,509	2.00
1889	37,234	1.50	1898	165,654	(a)
1890	25,697	1.00	1899	187,954	(a)
1891	20,153	1.00	1900	238,256	(a)
1892	30,294	1.00	1901	351,259	(a)

* Three dollars per ton on pig iron made from Canadian ore and \$2 per ton on pig iron made from foreign ore.

In the following table will be found a statement of the quantities of steel ingots, steel billets, and puddled bars manufactured in Canada and of the bounties paid thereon from 1896 to 1901, inclusive:

Quantities of steel and amount of bounty paid on steel in Canada from 1896 to 1901, inclusive.

Year ended June 30—	Steel ingots.		Steel billets.		Puddled bars,	
	Quantity.	Bounty paid.	Quantity.	Bounty paid.	Quantity.	Bounty paid.
	Short tons.		Short tons.		Short tons.	
1896			29,749	\$59,498	2,806	\$5,611
1897			8,683	17,366	1,509	3,019
1898	18,137	\$54,412	4,912	13,042	2,615	7,706
1899	24,881	74,644	(b)	(b)	5,837	17,511
1900	21,453	64,360	(b)	(b)	3,374	10,121
1901	33,352	100,058	(b)	(b)	5,568	16,703

* Manufactured in 1896-97 and paid for in 1897-98.

b No bounty paid on steel billets after June 30, 1897.

Also an article from London Iron and Coal Trade Review, February 23, 1906:

CANADIAN IRON AND STEEL.

The tariff commission in Canada has been asked by Mr. F. P. Jones, general manager of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, that the bounties on iron and steel be put back to the rates at which they were in the last fiscal year, namely, \$2.25 per ton on pig iron made from Canadian ore, \$1.50 on pig iron made from imported ore, \$2.25 on steel ingots. These rates he urged the government to reestablish and retain unchanged until June 30, 1908. He asked also that a duty be placed on barbed and galvanized wire. Out of 37,000 tons of these descriptions of wire used in Canada in the last fiscal year he said that the small quantity of 3,000 tons was made in Canada, and this limited tonnage was made under an agreement with United States manufacturers, who not only dictated to Canadians what quantity they might make, but also the price at which it must be sold. He declared that if the imports of these wires from the United States are allowed to continue as at present the company's rod mill can be operated for only a portion of the year.

From the foregoing may readily be seen the difficulties that we have to encounter in our struggle to get into the world's markets.

Now, I submit that this is not only a wise policy and a necessary policy, but that no man has suggested an iota of proof that the policy results in increasing the cost of a single American article to a single American consumer. I say no man has suggested that.

Our friends, the opposition, have satisfied themselves by making the statement that we sell abroad at less than we sell at home, and then they expect you and expect the people to jump to the conclusion that we suffer thereby. I say that there is no proof to that effect and there is ample proof to the contrary.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will my friend from Pennsylvania allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the manufacturing interests in this country have a right to sell abroad for the prices they can get abroad, and at home for the prices that they can get at home. But when they do sell abroad, whether cheaper than they do at home or higher than they do at home, does it not demonstrate that they are making the commodity as cheap as their foreign competitor is making it abroad, and they need not fear competition with a foreign competitor that has to pay ocean freight rates to reach our home markets?

Mr. DALZELL. I do not think the question of cost has anything to do with the price in the foreign market.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But protection—

Mr. DALZELL. So far as protection is concerned I have already answered the gentleman.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will ask the gentleman what he is protesting against if we make as cheap a product here as they do abroad? We still have the protection of a foreign freight rate coming to our shores to protect us to that extent.

Mr. DALZELL. We need protection to the American working man against those periods when in the case of a trade depression abroad our markets are made a dumping ground for their products, and I illustrated the proposition by citing to the gentleman the imports of iron and steel in 1900 and 1901.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to my friend from Pennsylvania that so far as I am informed the manufacturers in my district exported iron to Europe during the hard times. It was because they could not find markets to sell in at home. I give him that instance as going to show that we were going into the foreign market to build up trade for our workmen in hard times.

Mr. DALZELL. Will the gentleman tell me when, since the passage of the Dingley bill, they have had any hard times in the iron and steel industry?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. In answer to that I will say that in my district we have not had furnaces out of blast permanently in the last ten or twelve years [applause on the Republican side], either under the McKinley Administration or the Cleveland Administration. We have been, to an extent, prosperous under both. The gentleman asked me when we did have hard times under the McKinley Act. I will answer that the first year under the Dingley bill the price of pig iron and steel rails was no higher than the last year under the Wilson bill. It was not until we got into war with Spain and the Government made large purchases of material at home, spending large sums of money, that the era of prosperity began.

Mr. DALZELL. I can not yield to the gentleman any further.

I say no evidence has been offered, and none can be, that it costs the American consumer anything because we sell abroad at a lower price than we do at home.

In proof of that proposition I am going to confine myself to a single article, and I will do so simply because it seems to be the chief object of attack, and that is steel rails.

England is a free-trade country. A comparison of the prices of steel rails in that country and in our own country in the last ten years does not, however, show that, because we have protected our steel-rail industry or for any other reason, American railroad managers have paid any more for steel rails made at home than the managers of English railroads have paid for English rails. In the following table the prices for the United States are given upon the authority of the American Iron and Steel Association and for England upon the authority of Mr. J. S. Jeans, the secretary of the British Iron Trade Association. English prices have been reduced to their equivalents in American currency.

United States.		England.	
Years.	Average prices.	Years.	Average prices.
1895	\$24.33	1895	\$21.89
1896	25.00	1896	21.69
1897	18.75	1897	23.35
1898	17.62	1898	23.49
1899	25.12	1899	26.80
1900	32.29	1900	36.01
1901	27.33	1901	29.45
1902	28.00	1902	27.37
1903	28.00	1903	27.97
1904	28.00	1904	22.48
Average for ten years	26.04	Average for ten years	26.05

In 1904 the steel-rail industry in England was depressed and prices fell. In 1905 the demand for steel rails improved. On October 6, 1905, the London Iron and Coal Trades Review reported the price at Middlesbrough to be £5 7s. 6d., which is the equivalent of \$26.15.

So that as far as that particular item of rails is concerned, it is manifest that there have been no unreasonable prices since those of our own and of the English market conform. If there had been any unreasonable prices in England, we certainly would have heard of it. No complaints are made there. No one ever hears of unreasonable prices for steel rails in the United States except from two sources, and they are Democratic politicians and the Democratic press.

Railroad managers do not complain; nor do the customers of railroads, for our rates are the lowest in the world.

The gentleman from Mississippi put into the Record a letter purporting to have been written by Mr. Schwab to Mr. Frick. How that letter became public, if it was ever written, the gentleman did not explain. It seems in the first place to have been taken from a western newspaper. Where the newspaper got it no one knows; certainly not from Mr. Schwab or Mr. Frick. It is manifest from the face of that letter that it is a fake.

Mr. Schwab is represented as saying:

I know positively that England can not produce pig iron at the actual cost for less than \$11.50 a ton, even allowing no profit on raw materials, and can not put pig iron into a rail, with their most efficient work, for less than \$7.50 a ton.

Now, if you will take \$11.50 for pig iron, which the United States can make no cheaper than England, from \$12 a ton for steel rails, you have nothing at all left for your manufacture. You certainly can not turn pig iron into steel rails for 50 cents a ton. The letter is a fake on the face of it.

But I go a step further and say:

The charge that steel rails can be made at Pittsburg at "about \$12 a ton" is an old one, which has been many times refuted, as fixing the American cost of steel rails. In May, 1899, to which time the charge was referred, it might have been possible for the Carnegie Steel Company to assemble the raw materials entering into steel rails and convert them into the finished product at "about \$12 a ton," provided that, in obtaining its raw materials, it drew only on its own sources of supply and used only its own lines of transportation, and that the estimated cost of conversion did not include any return for the vast amount of capital invested in the various plants of the company and in its railroads and lake vessels, or any allowance for the wear and tear of machinery, or for the value of the iron ore and coal in the mine, the limestone in the quarry, and the natural gas—all raw materials which when consumed do not reproduce themselves, but have cost a great deal of money. It must be remembered, too, that at the time to which this \$12 charge originally related, wages were lower than they are to-day and the price of rails was much lower. In May, 1899, some contracts for steel rails were "running below \$20."

What would be thought of the level-headedness of a farmer who would estimate the cost of a field of wheat at a sum per bushel which would omit all allowance for the price he had paid for his farm; or for his horses, harness, plows, seed-drills, and thrashing machines; or for taxes; or would neglect to take account of the necessary repairs to his house and barn, fences, etc.? And yet it would be just as reasonable to accept as conclusive that farmer's arithmetic as the \$12-steel-rail estimate.

That the charge that "about \$12 a ton" covers the cost of steel rails to-day, even with leading elements of the cost omitted, can not be even approximately true is overwhelmingly answered by one simple fact, without citing others, namely, that the price for Bessemer pig iron at Pittsburg, the leading but not the only raw material from which steel rails are made, and of which the Carnegie Steel Company has been a large buyer, is from \$18.10 to \$18.35 a ton. More than a ton of pig iron is required to produce a ton of steel rails. How then could the cost of steel rails be "about \$12" a ton?

But steel products, like all other products, vary in the market according to the different conditions. Mr. Tom Johnson, a steel rail manufacturer, said on the floor of this House in January, 1894, that the fair price for steel rails at that time was \$19 a ton, and he said that steel rails ought to cost \$2 a ton in addition to the cost of the billets; that billets were then \$17 a ton, and a fair price for rails was \$19 a ton. But that was in the depressed times of the Cleveland Administration. Steel billets to-day in the open market are \$27 a ton. If you add \$2 a ton, you have \$29 for steel rails, which is a dollar a ton more than the market price.

I submit with great confidence that a comparison of prices from year to year will show that the regulating factors are the law of supply and demand and competition.

And I want to say this, that there is no monopoly of the iron and the steel business in the United States, and that in the very nature of things it is absolutely impossible that there should be such a monopoly. Our country is too vast in extent, its mineral wealth is too widely diffused, its capital for investment is too large, its individual enterprise and energy—the greatest factor in our national development—is too great to allow any man or men or any corporation to have a monopoly of the great iron and steel industry in this United States. [Applause on the Republican side.]

And I want to say another thing, our friends upon the other side to the contrary notwithstanding: The United States Steel Company is not a trust. It makes on an average not more than

half the iron and steel product of this country. The independent companies are companies of large capital, ample resources, modern mills, and having large mineral wealth.

Where will you find in all the world any finer manufacturing plants than the Cambria Steel Works at Johnstown, the Pennsylvania Steel Works at Steelton, the Maryland Steel Works at Sparrows Point, and in the district of my friend from Alabama, the great Tennessee Coal and Iron Company, or in Colorado, the Colorado Fuel Company? With these in the field, from the very nature of the case, a monopoly of this industry is absolutely impossible.

Then I want to say another thing—that there is no combination in this country to fix the price of steel rails. I want you to note that steel rails have never been as high in price since the organization of the United States Steel Company as they were prior to that time.

It is the policy of this much-abused corporation not to raise prices, but to maintain the stability of prices, and it has rendered a great service to the commerce and industry of this country during the time of its existence in that direction. Let me quote to you. In their earliest report to its stockholders the board of directors of that company made this statement and published it:

The demand for the products of the several companies has been so great that prices could easily have been advanced. Indeed, higher prices have been voluntarily offered by consumers who were anxious for immediate execution of orders, but the companies have firmly maintained the position of not advancing prices, believing that the existing prices were sufficient to yield a fair return on capital and maintain the properties in satisfactory physical condition, and that the many collateral advantages to be gained in the long run by refusing to advance prices would be of substantial and lasting value, not only to the companies, but also to the general business interests of the country. The strong position thus taken by the companies for stability in prices both of raw material and finished products has had a reassuring effect on the trade and has contributed greatly toward restoring confidence in the general business situation and creating a large demand for steel products by dispelling any doubt as to prices in the future.

That was the declaration of the company. Now, what say the outsiders?

Mr. STANLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DALZELL. Yes.

Mr. STANLEY. Does the United States Steel Company make woven wire and wire fence and products of that sort?

Mr. DALZELL. I think not; I think those are made by the American Steel and Wire Company.

Mr. STANLEY. Is there any connection between the United States Steel Company and that company?

Mr. DALZELL. I do not know.

The New York Sun, in its issue of January 31, 1902, in commenting upon this statement by the board of directors, said:

The United States Steel Corporation has so far done exactly what its managers have here said they were trying and will continue to try to do. They have rigidly kept their prices down to the point of reasonableness.

The Louisville Courier-Journal, a leading Democratic paper, said:

The policy of the corporation so far has been to try to make money by reducing the cost of production, not by advancing the price to the consumer.

And all this time, mark you, the company was paying and still continues to pay the highest wages in the world.

The Commercial and Financial Chronicle, of New York, the highest financial authority in this country, reviewing our large production of pig iron in 1901, said:

One feature in connection with the year's large production and consumption of iron should not escape attention, for it is in one sense really the most striking characteristic of that period. We refer to the fact that, with the demand larger and more urgent than ever before in the country's history, prices were kept within moderate limits. In the case of every one of the leading articles of iron and steel the average of prices for 1901 is lower than the average for 1900, and in most cases it is very much lower. For this result, preventing that extreme upward movement in values which on so many previous occasions has proven disastrous to the iron and steel industries, the policy of the United States Steel Corporation is largely responsible.

In the early part of the previous year, as will perhaps be remembered, prices had risen to very high figures, but then a decline set in which continued almost to the close of 1900. The beginning of 1901, therefore, found prices at a fairly low level. The business career of the United States Steel Corporation may be said to date from the 1st of April. Before the organization of this company the destructive competition threatened by the rivalry of the different separate companies which are now embraced in its control acted somewhat to demoralize the iron and steel trades so that some intending buyers were induced to withhold their orders. With the possibility of disturbance from that source removed, the demand, already large, became more active than before, and if the steel corporation had not firmly resisted the rising tendency prices would undoubtedly have quickly recovered to the extraordinarily high figures ruling at the beginning of 1900.

But the managers of that concern made it a cardinal point in their policy to keep prices at a level only high enough to leave a fair margin of profit, and their action of course dominated the trade. The result is that prices at the close of 1901, while ruling above the low figures prevailing at the close of 1900, did not on the whole show any great

advances. The price of steel rails was raised from \$26 a ton to \$28 in May, but early in 1900 the price had been \$35, and the average of rails for the whole year 1901 was only \$27.33, against \$32.29, the average for 1900. Bessemer pig iron at Pittsburgh averaged \$16.37 in December, 1901, against \$13.75 in December, 1900, but in February, 1900, the price had been \$25 a ton. Steel billets at Pittsburgh were \$34.50 in January, 1900; \$19.75 in December, 1900, and \$27.50 in December, 1901.

The Commercial and Financial Chronicle of New York is not a partisan journal, nor is its trade columns edited for political purposes.

Now I submit that I have shown that no evidence has been adduced that the custom of selling abroad for less than at home has added anything to the cost to the American consumer. I have further shown affirmatively that it does not, and that under existing law prices are reasonable. I submit that I have further shown that our selling abroad at reduced prices is limited in extent and is in accordance with the universal custom of the world's export trade, is to the advantage of the home consumer, and especially to the advantage of the American workman, and that even if subject to criticism it can not be remedied by tinkering with the tariff. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, I fain would stop here, but a remark made by the gentleman from Mississippi the other day urges me to proceed. I say that in any event there is no danger that the people of this country will intrust to the Democratic party the power to revise the tariff, for two reasons. First, because the party has no convictions on the subject, and second, because it has only recently shown its utter inability wisely to deal with it. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

The gentleman from Mississippi said the other day, pointing his finger across the aisle, "You have neither the courage nor the intellect to revise the tariff." Alas! alas! that I can go the gentleman from Mississippi one better and reply in the language of a Democratic leader, uttered on the floor of this House, that his party had neither the courage nor the honesty to make a tariff law. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] The gentleman from Mississippi says, "If you don't revise it, we will." What a pretty mess his party made of tariff revision when they undertook it. Clothed with absolute power, having possession of the House, the Senate, and the Executive, they brought forth a measure that their own President baptized as a measure of party perfidy and party dishonor, and that the people of this country at the very first available opportunity scouted with disgust. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

I want you, my Democratic friends, to listen, bearing in mind what the gentleman from Mississippi says, to what one of your own leaders had to say on the subject, the gentleman to whom the gentleman from Mississippi gave a certificate of character only the other day. Mr. Tom Johnson said, while the Wilson bill was being made:

Mr. Chairman, we of the Democratic party went before the country in 1892 asserting that the existing tariff was wrong in principle and unjust in operation, declaring the policy of protection a fraud and a robbery, charging it with creating trusts, throttling industry, enforcing idleness, lessening wages, impoverishing labor, and creating a few monstrous fortunes, and pledging ourselves to abolish it if the American people gave us authority. They did give us authority, and then our haste to repeal oppressive taxes subsided, and instead of flying at the throat of protective barons and robber trusts the great Democratic party began, as it were, to wag its tail and look for crumbs. * * * While we have been fiddling, Rome has been burning. While we have been seeking offices and peddling offices the very disasters that we predicted from Republican misrule have come upon the country. Who shall sell stamps at Stringtown Cross Roads and who shall play ambassador at the court of Italy have been settled, but the burning question of the tariff is yet at sea and in the dark. And now, when, after the Christmas turkey and the New Year wine, we meet to consider at our leisure what shall be done to carry out the mandate of the people, given us almost a year and a half ago, the cry of distress goes up from all parts of the land, and American citizens by the hundred thousand are being fed by charity to prevent starvation.

"Oh, if you don't revise the tariff, we will." [Laughter and applause on Republican side.]

Never was the difference between Democratic profession and Democratic practice more clearly illustrated than in that party's futile attempt to stand by its professed principles, when it had the opportunity to do so.

Listen to the distinguished gentleman who then led the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. Wilson of West Virginia. He opened the battle with a high-sounding manifesto:

We begin our task by an effort to free from taxation those things on which the industrial prosperity and growth of our country so largely depend.

Of all the reductions made in this bill there are none in their benefit to the consumer, none in their benefit to the laborer that can be compared with the removal of the taxes from the materials of industry. We have felt that we could not begin a thorough reform of the existing system, built up as I have shown, story by story until it has cleared the clouds, except by a removal of all taxation on the great materials that lie at the basis of modern industry, and so the bill proposes to put on the free list wool, iron ore, coal, and lumber. * * * The ques-

tion of a tariff on coal is neither a question of protection nor a question of revenue, but simply a question of subsidy to the great railroad corporations of the country.

And so the Democratic party, making tariff bills according to the confession of its leader, subsidized the great railroad corporations to the extent of 40 cents a ton duty on coal.

But that is not all. The distinguished leader of the Democratic party, making a tariff bill, said further:

Mr. Chairman, every reason for putting coal on the free list applies with equal if not stronger force to removing the duty from iron ore. If duties are laid for revenue, we could not select any duties more hurtful to American industries or more injurious to American labor than duties levied upon production. * * * Upon no ground of protection can the duty on iron ore be any longer justified in this country.

And yet, alas for the credit of Democratic courage, intellect, and honesty, the gentleman and his colleagues proceeded to put what he called an indefensible duty, of 40 cents a ton on iron ore.

The Wilson bill, made by the Democratic party, was absurd, inconsistent, and illogical, but worst of all it was a sectional bill.

It reenacted Mason and Dixon's line. Listen to some of the absurdities and sectionalism in that bill: Copper ingots were called raw material and made free, but pig iron was dutiable at 22½ per cent ad valorem as a manufactured product. Tennessee marble was protected by a duty of 40 cents per cubic foot, but New England granite was free. Combed wool was dutiable at 25 per cent, but combed silk was free. Cleaned Southern rice was dutiable at 1½ cents per pound, but sawed shingles and lumber from Maine were free. Binding twine was free while bagging was taxed. Agricultural implements were free while the steel from which they are made was dutiable. Ties to bind cotton were free, but to bind hay were taxed.

In face of this bungle of grotesque inconsistencies the gentleman from Mississippi calls across the aisle to us that we have neither the courage nor the intellect to make a tariff bill. Every splendid page in every splendid chapter of all the harvest years of Republican rule and protection is his answer. "If you do not revise the tariff," he says, "we will." [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

I am disposed to stop, and yet I think I shall not stop here because I want to have the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] have all the light possible on the subject, and I want to say to him in the mildest way that I can that American history contains no record so steeped in cowardice and dishonesty as the record of the Democratic party's attempt to make a tariff bill, and I propose to prove it. I propose to prove that proposition out of the mouths of witnesses, everyone of whom shall be a Democrat. Said the New York Sun, a Democratic paper:

Taking revenue and antirevenue together, the Wilson bill is a fantastic and personal bill. It is a jungle of unconstitutionality and favoritisms compounded to gratify the more powerful applicants for license to rob and to vindicate the hobbies of Grover Cleveland put on record previous to the Chicago platform. It is the greatest humbug of the age.

Said the Louisville Courier-Journal—and I assume that no Democrat will question the orthodox Democracy of that paper:

If in the Democracy of this country there is a depth of shame which had not before been stirred by Democracy's alleged representatives in the United States Senate, within the past six months it has certainly been reached by the action of the Finance Committee in the latest compromise bill agreed on. Instead of a bill redeeming the pledges they were commissioned to redeem, a mongrel piebald of patches and pusillanimity, a grotesque hodgepodge of pretense and pettifoggery, a nondescript abortion of incompetency, selfishness, cowardice, and treachery is the outcome.

"Oh, if you don't revise the tariff, we will." [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Said President Cleveland:

There is no excuse for mistaking or misapprehending the feeling and temper of the rank and file of the Democracy. They are downcast under the assertion that their party fails in ability to manage the Government; they are apprehensive that efforts to bring about tariff reform may fail; but they are much more downcast and apprehensive in their fear that Democratic principles may be surrendered.

Every true Democrat and every sincere tariff reformer knows that this bill in its present form—

Alluding to the Senate bill subsequently adopted *en bloc* by the House—

and as it will be submitted to the conference, falls far short of the consummation for which we have long labored, for which we have suffered defeat without discouragement, which in its anticipation gave us a rallying cry in our day of triumph, and which in its promise of accomplishment is so interwoven with Democratic pledges and Democratic success, that our abandonment of the cause or the principles upon which it rests means party perfidy and party dishonor.

I have a further extract—

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. May I ask you one more question?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania has proven that that was a bill of party perfidy and party dishonor, has he not succeeded in establishing the proposition that it was not a Democratic tariff bill?

Mr. DALZELL. No; because it was passed by a Democratic House and illustrates what I say, that they have no convictions on the subject.

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. Was it not condemned by the Courier Journal and all the Democratic press and all the leading Democrats in the House?

Mr. DALZELL. It was introduced in the House of Representatives—

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. As a compromise.

Mr. DALZELL. And passed here under force of a rule and against the protests of some Democrats who had the courage to stand by their convictions. Now, I am not through; wait until I get through.

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. But I want to ask the gentleman how he establishes both propositions, that it was an instance of party perfidy and party dishonor and still it was a party measure?

Mr. DALZELL. I establish the proposition which I started out to establish by saying that Democratic party professions are one thing and Democratic party practices are another thing. [Applause on the Republican side.] Why, the Democratic party was just as bombastic and concealed as to its power to enact a tariff law then as it is now. [Applause on the Republican side.] I recall when the absurd Wilson bill was reported in the House that in their exuberance the since peerless leader of two defeats and the gentleman then from Virginia, now the president of a great university, carried on their stalwart shoulders the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. I recall also the difference between that joyful day and that other day of sorrow when the Wilson bill was passed. It has been described in language that far surpasses anything that I could use by the peerless orator from New York [Mr. COCKRAN]. He said [laughter]:

Last winter we passed a bill through this House under the leadership of the gentleman from West Virginia, a bill for tariff reform, which in my humble judgment meant the industrial emancipation of this country and the ultimate industrial conquests of the world by American labor and American genius. That bill passed through this House amid such a scene of triumph and joy as never has been witnessed in the history of a legislative body. On that momentous day the gentleman from West Virginia, borne upon affectionate and loyal shoulders, was the central figure of a demonstration which evidenced the depth of feeling throughout the American people, long pent up, and at last fondly considered triumphant over all obstructions. To-day no more pathetic figure in the history of the world can be observed than that same leader, shorn of his support, walking down these aisles, disdaining to prevaricate or misrepresent the actual condition which confronts us, confessing that he has been deserted by those in whose support he had every reason to confide—

And conspicuous among the deserters was the gentleman from Mississippi—

and asking us to record our betrayal of every principle which this House under his leadership has maintained. We are hopelessly discredited because our cowardice makes our surrender disgraceful.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

Just one more quotation in reply to the assertion that we have neither the intellect nor the courage to make a tariff bill.

Said Mr. Harter of Ohio—you recall him, no doubt—a loyal Democrat, since gone to his reward:

If passed and branded as a Democratic measure (speaking of the Wilson bill), it would stamp us as a lot of imbeciles and our managers in both Houses as driveling idiots.

[Loud applause on the Republican side.]

"Oh, if you do not pass a tariff bill, we will!"

Now, Mr. Chairman, I must omit some things that I would like to have said.

[Cries of "Do not do it," and "Go ahead."]

Well, I think I have proven my case so far as Tom Johnson's assertion was concerned—that his party had neither the honesty nor the courage nor the ability to make a tariff law.

Now, I go a step farther and say, even if the party possessed the qualifications, it still could not make a tariff law, for the reason that it has no convictions on the subject. The general trend of the Democratic party, so far as its history discloses, is toward free trade, but it is for anything at any time that will catch the popular ear. Let us look a little into its history. The Democratic party has been for protection and against protection. It has declared protection robbery and unconstitutional. It has at times refused to declare itself at all on the subject when it thought that course was the most discreet. On one occasion, in a spirit of cowardice, it relegated to the people to say what its policies should be. Now, let us look a little at it historically.

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. May I ask one other question?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. While you are proposing to look at it from a historical standpoint, I would like to remind the gentleman from Pennsylvania—

Mr. DALZELL. I was asked for a question, not for a reminder.

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. That the lowest tariff in American history was passed by the Republican party in 1857.

Mr. DALZELL. Well, we won't stop to discuss that proposition; the gentleman has made his reminder, now I will go on. In 1832, with Jackson and Van Buren as its Presidential and Vice-Presidential candidates, it declared for protection. I read from its platform:

Resolved, That an adequate protection to American industry is indispensable to the prosperity of the country, and that an abandonment of the policy at this period would be attended with consequences ruinous to the best interests of the nation.

And then they added a tail to it that I want to call your attention to, because I want to refer to it a little later on.

Resolved, That a uniform system of internal improvements, sustained and supported by the General Government, is calculated to secure in the highest degree the harmony, the strength, and the permanency of the Republic.

That was the platform in 1832. The platform of 1840 says:

Resolved, That the Constitution does not confer upon the General Government the power to commence and carry on a general system of internal improvement.

[Laughter.]

In 1848 the platform openly avowed its adherence to free trade. It said:

Resolved, That the fruits of the great political triumph of 1844, which elected James K. Polk and George M. Dallas President and Vice-President of the United States, have fulfilled the hopes of the Democracy of the Union (reciting a number of things) in the noble impulse given to the cause of free trade by the repeal of the tariff of 1842.

In 1868 it declared for—

revenue on foreign imports and such equal taxation under internal-revenue laws as will afford incidental protection.

In 1872 (now this is worth listening to), choosing as its standard bearers its old time and lifelong enemy, Horace Greeley, it was for "anything to beat Grant," and on the tariff question it said this:

Recognizing that there are in our midst honest but irreconcilable differences of opinion with regard to the respective systems of protection and free trade, we remit the discussion of the subject to the people in their Congressional districts.

[Loud applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

Now, you know in that campaign there were some Democrats who were not willing to wallow in the mire, and, though few in numbers, they met and nominated a Presidential ticket composed of Charles O'Connor and John Quincy Adams. And I want you to have their opinion as to what they thought of the Democratic party's platform that I have just read to you. They said:

Resolved, That we proclaim to the world that principle is to be preferred to power; that the Democratic party is held together by the cohesion of the time-honored principle which they will never surrender in exchange for all the offices which Presidents can confer. The pangs of the minorities are doubtless excruciating; but we welcome an eternal minority under the banner inscribed with our principles rather than an almighty majority purchased by their abandonment.

In 1876 and in 1880 the party declared for tariff for revenue only; their present doctrine, as we all know, and as it will officially remain until they have a new national convention and renewed opportunity to turn another somersault, is that "protection is robbery."

I say that their official doctrine is that protection is robbery, so as to contradistinguish it from the doctrine of some of its leaders. The gentleman from Missouri—and there is no gentleman in this House more respected for his character and ability, Judge DE ARMOND said that "free trade is an academic dream;" but his colleague from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] said, and he now resents as an insult that it should be repeated, that he "would tear down the custom-houses from turret to foundation stone." [Laughter.] The gentleman from Mississippi, popularly known as the leader of the minority, denies that he is a free trader, and yet he fills the Record with chapters from Bastiat, who Thomas B. Reed said was "the brightest free trader that ever charged down the line, and that he furnished the opposition with both their brains and their dialectics." And the gentleman from Mississippi treated us not only to a chapter from Bastiat, but also a chapter from Robinson Crusoe. I think that we owe him thanks that he did not give us a chapter from Mother Goose. [Laughter.]

In a recent interview, published in the Washington Post, which the gentleman from Mississippi has not denied, he said:

We will make a tariff bill—

That is what he said on the floor of the House, too—

We will make a tariff bill; it will not be an ideal tariff bill, because we must to some extent be guided by actual conditions surrounding us, which will make us swerve—

Swerve!—

to some extent from the ideal, but it will be an approximation to it.

It will, I apprehend, be such another case of swerving as was illustrated in the Wilson-Gorman bill. I very much fear that the gentleman is swerving from ideals for votes. [Laughter and applause on Republican side.]

But hearken, now, to the true Democratic doctrine from a gentleman who has the courage to stand by his guns. It is the voice of the peerless orator from New York. Says Mr. BOURKE COCKRAN:

The tariff is a scheme of plunder. Republicans do not call it that, but disguise it under mellifluous phrases. If you break the harmony of distribution of plunder, you will soon call in the police. You can not expect certain interests that have been enjoying this favoritism of plunder to give it up willingly. * * * Less than fifty years from now the speeches for protection and high tariff will sound as ridiculous as those of the beginning of the eighteenth century against exports and those against witchcraft of the century before.

The gentleman from New York wears no mask.

Democratic leaders, as you will have observed, for the most part, now deny that they are free traders, and declare for a tariff for revenue, or a revenue tariff with incidental protection.

What is a tariff for revenue?

It is a tariff or tax placed upon such articles of foreign production imported here as will produce the largest revenue with the lowest tax. Said Robert J. Walker, author of the revenue tariff of 1846:

The only true maxim is that which experience demonstrates will bring in each case the largest revenue at the lowest rate of duty, and that no duty be imposed on any article above the lowest rate which will yield the largest amount of revenue.

Will you tell me how many of your industries would survive a tariff of that character? Will you tell me how many mills would continue to operate, how many furnaces would be in blast, how many looms would continue their hum, how many farms would compete with the cheaper labor and the illimitable cheaper lands across the Canadian border? Will you tell me how you would house and feed the hundreds of thousands of idle workmen, their wives and their little ones?

God forbid that our eyes shall ever see the day of a tariff for revenue only. [Loud applause.]

Mr. GRAHAM. Before the gentleman proceeds further will he permit me to ask the gentleman from Kentucky, who interrupted him a few moments ago, how he figures out that the Republican party made a tariff law in 1857, when we did not come into power until 1861?

Mr. DALZELL. That is easy for a Democrat.

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. With the permission of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I will answer.

Mr. DALZELL. No, I can not yield just now.

But some of our Democratic friends say, "we are not for a revenue tariff, but for a revenue tariff with incidental protection."

Well, why not for a revenue tariff? "Oh," says the gentleman from Mississippi, "we can not tear down the existing structure overnight."

He does not propose to strangle our industries, he only proposes to kill them by slow poison.

He says "we can not tear down the structure overnight," and for that reason it would seem he is not for a revenue tariff. And yet a revenue tariff, the gentleman says, is the best tariff that this country ever saw, and that under the revenue tariff of 1846 we had the best times that we ever had, which is not true. Then why not a revenue tariff? Why has the gentleman not the courage of his convictions? If he believes what he says, then he is hoist with his own petard.

Incidental protection! Humbug and pretense! An insult to all reason and logic! If protection be robbery, then the difference between real protection and protection incidental or accidental is a difference only in degree. Both go down before the same argument. No ingenuity of reasoning can draw a distinction. It is only the difference between highway robbery and petty larceny. As for me, if it be a case of robbery at all, I have a qualified respect for the audacity and courage of the highwayman, but nothing but contempt for the sneak thief—and pretty much the same feeling for his advocate. [Applause on the Republican side.]

How much incidental protection do you propose to give? Enough to save the industry? Then your protection is not incidental but real. Less than enough to save the industry? Then your protection is a sham, and you might as well have the courage to avow it and take the consequences.

Mr. Chairman, we are a great, practical people. We look around us and see that all the nations in the civilized world, save one, avow and practice the policy of protection. It seems to us that the wisdom of all these nations is greater than the wisdom of one. Over and against the names of Bastiat and Cobden and Adam Smith we put the name of that masterful intellect, Germany's great iron chancellor, Prince Bismarck, who in the German Reichstag, on May 14, 1882, said this:

The success of the United States in material development is the most illustrious of modern times. The American nation has not only successfully borne and suppressed the most gigantic and expensive war of all history, but immediately afterwards it disbanded its army, found employment for all its soldiers and marines, paid off most of its debt, gave labor and homes to all the unemployed of Europe as fast as they could arrive within its territory, and all by a system of taxation so indirect as not to be perceived, much less felt. Because it is my deliberate judgment that the prosperity of America is due to its system of protective laws, I urge that Germany has now reached that point where it is necessary to imitate the tariff system of the United States.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, we are a great, practical people. We are not accustomed to take our economics from college professors and the dreamers of other times, amidst now obsolete conditions. We do not read our tariff lessons out of books; we read them by the blazing light of open furnace doors, amid the noise of industrial activities, and in the sweat of our brows that we coin into wealth. And God help the man or the party that would put out those fires, still the music of that noise, and send the workman home to a foodless and hungry household. [Prolonged applause on the Republican side.] For, after all, Mr. Chairman, the question of protection is only a question of labor. It is the man who works that is its beneficiary, his wife and his children, and their future. It is, in the last analysis, the question of an adequate wage, measuring up to the severe demands of manhood citizenship. It is a question in which we are all interested, on that side of the House as well as on this. I would to God that we could clasp hands across that aisle in the common cause of the American workingman.

Oh, East is East, and West is West, and never the twain shall meet
Till earth and sky stand presently at God's great judgment seat.
But there is neither East nor West, Border, nor Breed nor Birth,
When two strong men stand face to face, though they come from the
ends of the earth.

[Prolonged applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. CURTIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 19264) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 1133. An act granting a pension to Mary Lockard;
H. R. 4222. An act granting a pension to Otto Boesewetter;
H. R. 4388. An act granting a pension to Laura Hilgeman;
H. R. 4406. An act granting a pension to Albert M. Ryan;
H. R. 4867. An act granting a pension to Louisa Gregg;
H. R. 7495. An act granting a pension to Susie M. Gerth;
H. R. 8144. An act granting a pension to Ada J. Lasswell;
H. R. 8833. An act granting a pension to Edna M. Johnson;
H. R. 8954. An act granting a pension to George Cunningham;
H. R. 9276. An act granting a pension to Mary E. O'Hare;
H. R. 10177. An act granting a pension to Elizabeth Kohler;
H. R. 10766. An act granting a pension to Rachel L. Bartlett;
H. R. 11303. An act granting a pension to Joseph Matthews;
H. R. 11686. An act granting a pension to William C. Berg-hahn;
H. R. 12194. An act granting a pension to Minnie Irwin;
H. R. 12561. An act granting a pension to Francis M. McClendon;
H. R. 12653. An act granting a pension to Sarah Adams;
H. R. 12807. An act granting a pension to Nancy Ann Gee;
H. R. 12874. An act granting a pension to Sarah Ellen Dickens;
H. R. 13024. An act granting a pension to William J. Beach;
H. R. 13421. An act granting a pension to John W. Wabgrass;
H. R. 13575. An act granting a pension to Frances Bell;
H. R. 13622. An act granting a pension to Mary Cochran;
H. R. 13704. An act granting a pension to Ann Dewler;
H. R. 13713. An act granting a pension to Allison W. Pollard;
H. R. 15032. An act granting a pension to Milton Diehl;

H. R. 15243. An act granting a pension to Artemesia T. Husbrook;

H. R. 15486. An act granting a pension to William H. M. Carpenter;

H. R. 15490. An act granting a pension to Mary E. Darcy;

H. R. 15523. An act granting a pension to Jose N. Lucero, alias Nasario Lucero;

H. R. 15588. An act granting a pension to Hester Hyatt;

H. R. 15695. An act granting a pension to John T. Wagoner;

H. R. 15807. An act granting a pension to Catharine Arnold;

H. R. 15855. An act granting a pension to Will E. Kayser;

H. R. 16173. An act granting a pension to Sarah Smith;

H. R. 16267. An act granting a pension to Catharine Piper;

H. R. 16320. An act granting a pension to Esther M. Noah;

H. R. 16390. An act granting a pension to Katharine Partridge;

H. R. 16627. An act granting a pension to Delilah Moore;

H. R. 16681. An act granting a pension to Gustave Bergen;

H. R. 16704. An act granting a pension to Lucy C. Strout;

H. R. 16931. An act granting a pension to Cornelia Mitchell;

H. R. 17108. An act granting a pension to Edith F. Morrison;

H. R. 17120. An act granting a pension to Rhoda Munsil;

H. R. 17205. An act granting a pension to Alice Garvey;

H. R. 17308. An act granting a pension to Margaret E. Eveland;

H. R. 17548. An act granting a pension to David J. Bentley;

H. R. 17558. An act granting a pension to Lizzie H. Prout;

H. R. 17586. An act granting a pension to Harriet A. Morton;

H. R. 17671. An act granting a pension to Sarah A. Thompson;

H. R. 17690. An act granting a pension to Ellen E. Leary;

H. R. 17788. An act granting a pension to Charles E. Benson;

H. R. 17826. An act granting a pension to Winney A. Lindsey;

H. R. 18005. An act granting a pension to Emily Compton;

H. R. 18157. An act granting a pension to James J. Winkler;

H. R. 18158. An act granting a pension to Isaac Cope;

H. R. 18169. An act granting a pension to Margaret Stevens;

H. R. 5842. An act to correct the military record of Charles F. Deisch;

H. R. 5217. An act for the relief of Agnes W. Hills and Sarah J. Hills;

H. R. 14410. An act to amend an act approved August 3, 1894, entitled "An act concerning leases in the Yellowstone National Park;"

H. R. 549. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Storr, jr.;

H. R. 718. An act granting an increase of pension to Hamilton D. Brown;

H. R. 735. An act granting an increase of pension to Frank L. Fornshell;

H. R. 1182. An act granting an increase of pension to Ezekiel Bridwell;

H. R. 1192. An act granting an increase of pension to George B. Hess;

H. R. 1413. An act granting an increase of pension to John Crawford;

H. R. 1482. An act granting an increase of pension to Philip Cook;

H. R. 1547. An act granting an increase of pension to William A. Olmsted;

H. R. 1557. An act granting an increase of pension to Frank J. Oatley;

H. R. 1719. An act granting an increase of pension to William N. Whitlock;

H. R. 1768. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Childers;

H. R. 1946. An act granting an increase of pension to James A. Sproull;

H. R. 2155. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Smith;

H. R. 2168. An act granting an increase of pension to William Bridges;

H. R. 2226. An act granting an increase of pension to George F. Long;

H. R. 2234. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob W. Gersteneker;

H. R. 2791. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Adams;

H. R. 2816. An act granting an increase of pension to James C. Town;

H. R. 3227. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac Tuttle;

H. R. 3345. An act granting an increase of pension to Christina White;

H. R. 3686. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry R. Cowan;

- H. R. 3694. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph D. Emery;
 H. R. 4240. An act granting an increase of pension to James F. Chipman;
 H. R. 4244. An act granting an increase of pension to John Spaulding;
 H. R. 4363. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas D. Campbell;
 H. R. 4594. An act granting an increase of pension to Joshua S. Ditto;
 H. R. 4595. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Tallant;
 H. R. 4625. An act granting an increase of pension to Anderson J. Smith;
 H. R. 4743. An act granting an increase of pension to Hiram N. Goodell;
 H. R. 4745. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry D. Stiehl;
 H. R. 4965. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel P. Holland;
 H. R. 5048. An act granting an increase of pension to William A. Failer;
 H. R. 5222. An act granting an increase of pension to Lewis R. Stegman;
 H. R. 5571. An act granting an increase of pension to William Cary;
 H. R. 5732. An act granting an increase of pension to Elias C. Kitchin;
 H. R. 5804. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Noyes;
 H. R. 6061. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Chapman;
 H. R. 6111. An act granting an increase of pension to Edwin R. Steenrod;
 H. R. 6112. An act granting an increase of pension to Edmund Fish;
 H. R. 6114. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Douglass;
 H. R. 6490. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Gilbert;
 H. R. 6498. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac C. France;
 H. R. 6546. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. White;
 H. R. 6578. An act granting an increase of pension to James B. McWhorter;
 H. R. 6776. An act granting an increase of pension to Stephen C. Smith;
 H. R. 6865. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Voss;
 H. R. 6912. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Weaver;
 H. R. 7419. An act granting an increase of pension to James Scott;
 H. R. 7498. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Hanson;
 H. R. 7500. An act granting an increase of pension to John McCandless;
 H. R. 7584. An act granting an increase of pension to James H. Kemp;
 H. R. 7876. An act granting an increase of pension to Julius Beier;
 H. R. 8091. An act granting an increase of pension to John Coughlin;
 H. R. 8138. An act granting an increase of pension to Similde E. Forbes;
 H. R. 8479. An act granting an increase of pension to Nellie A. Batchelder;
 H. R. 8547. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Madison;
 H. R. 8650. An act granting an increase of pension to Sewell F. Graves;
 H. R. 8662. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward F. Paramore;
 H. R. 8716. An act granting an increase of pension to John L. Coffey;
 H. R. 8737. An act granting an increase of pension to Horace A. Manley;
 H. R. 8771. An act granting an increase of pension to Florence Sullivan;
 H. R. 9034. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary F. McCauley;
 H. R. 9375. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles H. McKenney;
 H. R. 9529. An act granting an increase of pension to William Gibson;
 H. R. 9812. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Newbury;
 H. R. 9923. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph J. Mishler;
 H. R. 10008. An act granting an increase of pension to James W. Dorman;
 H. R. 10029. An act granting an increase of pension to Abram Higbie;
 H. R. 10246. An act granting an increase of pension to John Harrison;
 H. R. 10257. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel Deems;
 H. R. 10318. An act granting an increase of pension to James F. Hollett;
 H. R. 10319. An act granting an increase of pension to Harvey Deal;
 H. R. 10524. An act granting an increase of pension to Ebenezer W. Akerley;
 H. R. 10525. An act granting an increase of pension to Artemas D. Many;
 H. R. 10561. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph N. Piersler;
 H. R. 10774. An act granting an increase of pension to James D. Leach;
 H. R. 10922. An act granting an increase of pension to John McDonald;
 H. R. 10993. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel Jones;
 H. R. 11062. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Harlan;
 H. R. 11151. An act granting an increase of pension to John Sirmyer;
 H. R. 11365. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert D. Williamson;
 H. R. 11424. An act granting an increase of pension to Stephen W. Neal;
 H. R. 11466. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Heald;
 H. R. 11510. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph S. Larrance;
 H. R. 11552. An act granting an increase of pension to Abraham G. Leiser;
 H. R. 11822. An act granting an increase of pension to Lawyer Sugs;
 H. R. 11917. An act granting an increase of pension to Davis Preston;
 H. R. 12189. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Hinds;
 H. R. 12010. An act granting an increase of pension to Lewis Hoffmann;
 H. R. 12088. An act granting an increase of pension to Louisa Spielman;
 H. R. 12160. An act granting an increase of pension to Josephine D. McNary;
 H. R. 12180. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Dunning;
 H. R. 12238. An act granting an increase of pension to Helen S. Brown;
 H. R. 12279. An act granting an increase of pension to James S. Topping;
 H. R. 12304. An act granting an increase of pension to John McDonough;
 H. R. 12331. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel J. Miller;
 H. R. 12372. An act granting an increase of pension to J. Morgan Seabury;
 H. R. 12480. An act granting an increase of pension to James McKenna;
 H. R. 12588. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Dickinson;
 H. R. 12664. An act granting an increase of pension to William E. Wallace;
 H. R. 12727. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin D. Bogia;
 H. R. 12733. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Kelsey;
 H. R. 12734. An act granting an increase of pension to Abram Van Riper;
 H. R. 12762. An act granting an increase of pension to Jesse H. Brandt;
 H. R. 12792. An act granting an increase of pension to William Wiley;

H. R. 12810. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward Ross;
 H. R. 12813. An act granting an increase of pension to Reese Moore;
 H. R. 12842. An act granting an increase of pension to William J. Drake;
 H. R. 13026. An act granting an increase of pension to J. Bailey Orem;
 H. R. 13030. An act granting an increase of pension to John C. Heney;
 H. R. 13047. An act granting an increase of pension to Walter Saunders;
 H. R. 13060. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry De Graff;
 H. R. 13077. An act granting an increase of pension to James S. Prose;
 H. R. 13111. An act granting an increase of pension to Lewis S. Perkins;
 H. R. 13140. An act granting an increase of pension to Jesse W. Howe;
 H. R. 13227. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert Blancett;
 H. R. 13228. An act granting an increase of pension to Augustus Hathaway;
 H. R. 13229. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Holland;
 H. R. 13232. An act granting an increase of pension to Penina Owens;
 H. R. 13233. An act granting an increase of pension to Jesse A. B. Thorne;
 H. R. 13236. An act granting an increase of pension to William Haines;
 H. R. 13326. An act granting an increase of pension to Augustus McDaniel;
 H. R. 13337. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Harsh;
 H. R. 13465. An act granting an increase of pension to Eleanor Gregory;
 H. R. 13469. An act granting an increase of pension to Michael Davy, alias James Byron;
 H. R. 13493. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth J. Meek;
 H. R. 13506. An act granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Bachus;
 H. R. 13507. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Crowley;
 H. R. 13535. An act granting an increase of pension to William Kelly;
 H. R. 13577. An act granting an increase of pension to Ellen M. Van Brunt;
 H. R. 13679. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Nobinger;
 H. R. 13689. An act granting an increase of pension to William S. Newman;
 H. R. 13809. An act granting an increase of pension to James P. Tucker;
 H. R. 13861. An act granting an increase of pension to Wilhelm Dickhoff;
 H. R. 13877. An act granting an increase of pension to Juan Canasco;
 H. R. 13882. An act granting an increase of pension to Levi L. Price;
 H. R. 13923. An act granting an increase of pension to Martin Dayhuff;
 H. R. 13979. An act granting an increase of pension to Emeline A. Stewart;
 H. R. 13991. An act granting an increase of pension to Wiley H. Dixon;
 H. R. 14072. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Reeder;
 H. R. 14106. An act granting an increase of pension to John S. Melton;
 H. R. 14118. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward Delany;
 H. R. 14142. An act granting an increase of pension to James A. Scrutchedfield;
 H. R. 14169. An act granting an increase of pension to Bettie Stern;
 H. R. 14198. An act granting an increase of pension to William T. Stewart;
 H. R. 14200. An act granting an increase of pension to John K. Dalzell;
 H. R. 14237. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac Kindle;

H. R. 14328. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Mears;
 H. R. 14391. An act granting an increase of pension to Franklin Cooley;
 H. R. 14470. An act granting an increase of pension to William A. Braselton;
 H. R. 14490. An act granting an increase of pension to Martha A. Kenney;
 H. R. 14493. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Gentles, alias Henry Hopner;
 H. R. 14504. An act granting an increase of pension to Aaron P. Seeley;
 H. R. 14539. An act granting an increase of pension to Louis C. Robinson;
 H. R. 14545. An act granting an increase of pension to Eliza L. Nixon;
 H. R. 14660. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel M. Philbrook;
 H. R. 14731. An act granting an increase of pension to Ezra H. Wiggins;
 H. R. 14736. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac C. Smallwood;
 H. R. 14745. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick B. Walton;
 H. R. 14801. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Armstrong;
 H. R. 14827. An act granting an increase of pension to William K. Stewart;
 H. R. 14839. An act granting an increase of pension to James McManis;
 H. R. 14854. An act granting an increase of pension to Harriet Howard;
 H. R. 14861. An act granting an increase of pension to Dennis W. Ray;
 H. R. 14955. An act granting an increase of pension to Eliza Moore;
 H. R. 14980. An act granting an increase of pension to Matthew H. Bellomy;
 H. R. 14982. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac N. Long;
 H. R. 14994. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel C. Joslyn;
 H. R. 14996. An act granting an increase of pension to John F. Smith;
 H. R. 15002. An act granting an increase of pension to George E. Wood;
 H. R. 15003. An act granting an increase of pension to James Gray;
 H. R. 15058. An act granting an increase of pension to Enoch Rector;
 H. R. 15064. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob Wagenknecht;
 H. R. 15102. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Ryckman;
 H. R. 15147. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Teas;
 H. R. 15149. An act granting an increase of pension to William W. Ferguson;
 H. R. 15152. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary T. Corns;
 H. R. 15178. An act granting an increase of pension to Matilda Morrison;
 H. R. 15180. An act granting an increase of pension to Amanda Pitman;
 H. R. 15201. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward O'Shea;
 H. R. 15206. An act granting an increase of pension to Peter G. Thompson;
 H. R. 15229. An act granting an increase of pension to Edwin Howes;
 H. R. 15233. An act granting an increase of pension to William G. Westover;
 H. R. 15272. An act granting an increase of pension to Patrick Mooney;
 H. R. 15274. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward W. Bell;
 H. R. 15275. An act granting an increase of pension to Jehu Martin;
 H. R. 15305. An act granting an increase of pension to Ezra H. Brown;
 H. R. 15316. An act granting an increase of pension to James McKelvy;
 H. R. 15355. An act granting an increase of pension to George M. Dailey;

- H. R. 15418. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel P. Sargent;
 H. R. 15450. An act granting an increase of pension to Virginia J. D. Holmes;
 H. R. 15459. An act granting an increase of pension to Drucillar A. Massey;
 H. R. 15495. An act granting an increase of pension to Job B. Sanderson;
 H. R. 15499. An act granting an increase of pension to Elias Andrew;
 H. R. 15500. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Thomas;
 H. R. 15501. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Parks;
 H. R. 15539. An act granting an increase of pension to John McConnell;
 H. R. 15565. An act granting an increase of pension to Josias R. King;
 H. R. 15566. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew F. Kreger;
 H. R. 15592. An act granting an increase of pension to Levi H. Townsend;
 H. R. 15614. An act granting an increase of pension to Clark Cornett;
 H. R. 15632. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Sanders;
 H. R. 15634. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel M. Reese;
 H. R. 15641. An act granting an increase of pension to Eli Woodbury;
 H. R. 15675. An act granting an increase of pension to Harley Mowrey;
 H. R. 15682. An act granting an increase of pension to Hannah M. Hayes;
 H. R. 15748. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob R. Deckard;
 H. R. 15761. An act granting an increase of pension to Lafayette North;
 H. R. 15762. An act granting an increase of pension to Harmon Freeman, alias Harmon Storme;
 H. R. 15768. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Halbert;
 H. R. 15783. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Sutton;
 H. R. 15819. An act granting an increase of pension to William T. Burgess;
 H. R. 15854. An act granting an increase of pension to Phillip Schloesser;
 H. R. 15867. An act granting an increase of pension to Annie M. Stevens;
 H. R. 15886. An act granting an increase of pension to John Misner;
 H. R. 15925. An act granting an increase of pension to Abraham Walker;
 H. R. 15932. An act granting an increase of pension to Hartley B. Cox;
 H. R. 15943. An act granting an increase of pension to William D. Jones;
 H. R. 15972. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Smith;
 H. R. 15977. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Ramsey;
 H. R. 16044. An act granting an increase of pension to John C. Lindsay;
 H. R. 16098. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick Fenz;
 H. R. 16165. An act granting an increase of pension to Morris Smith;
 H. R. 16174. An act granting an increase of pension to John Williamson;
 H. R. 16186. An act granting an increase of pension to William T. A. H. Boles;
 H. R. 16193. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel Shrader;
 H. R. 16220. An act granting an increase of pension to George C. Powell;
 H. R. 16224. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Crawford;
 H. R. 16253. An act granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. Hope;
 H. R. 16255. An act granting an increase of pension to James S. Brand;
 H. R. 16271. An act granting an increase of pension to Edwin Elliott;
 H. R. 16274. An act granting an increase of pension to David Lindsey;
 H. R. 16279. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward E. Elliott;
 H. R. 16284. An act granting an increase of pension to George Rogers;
 H. R. 16285. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Johnson;
 H. R. 16295. An act granting an increase of pension to Laurence Foley;
 H. R. 16319. An act granting an increase of pension to Orrin D. Nichols;
 H. R. 16335. An act granting an increase of pension to John A. Bryan;
 H. R. 16372. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew Dorn;
 H. R. 16398. An act granting an increase of pension to David Ross;
 H. R. 16400. An act granting an increase of pension to James McCracken;
 H. R. 16408. An act granting an increase of pension to William Hendricks;
 H. R. 16423. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Roe;
 H. R. 16427. An act granting an increase of pension to William W. Carter;
 H. R. 16429. An act granting an increase of pension to Caroline M. Peirce;
 H. R. 16466. An act granting an increase of pension to Ase-nith Woodall;
 H. R. 16471. An act granting an increase of pension to North Ann Dorman;
 H. R. 16486. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Bosworth;
 H. R. 16491. An act granting an increase of pension to Lewis Denson;
 H. R. 16516. An act granting an increase of pension to James B. Fairchild;
 H. R. 16522. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Meyer;
 H. R. 16526. An act granting an increase of pension to James R. Hilliard;
 H. R. 16527. An act granting an increase of pension to William Martin;
 H. R. 16528. An act granting an increase of pension to Catharine Price;
 H. R. 16529. An act granting an increase of pension to James M. Sikes;
 H. R. 16530. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Gautier;
 H. R. 16535. An act granting an increase of pension to Jonathan I. Wright;
 H. R. 16536. An act granting an increase of pension to Cyrus S. Case;
 H. R. 16540. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Evans;
 H. R. 16541. An act granting an increase of pension to Ambrose Y. Teague;
 H. R. 16547. An act granting an increase of pension to John Rutter;
 H. R. 16566. An act granting an increase of pension to Whitman V. White;
 H. R. 16576. An act granting an increase of pension to Silas P. Conway;
 H. R. 16577. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Pound;
 H. R. 16586. An act granting an increase of pension to William Mattison;
 H. R. 16602. An act granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. Reeves;
 H. R. 16603. An act granting an increase of pension to Pleasant W. Cook;
 H. R. 16606. An act granting an increase of pension to James A. Duff;
 H. R. 16622. An act granting an increase of pension to James Webb;
 H. R. 16629. An act granting an increase of pension to Louis Stoeckig;
 H. R. 16630. An act granting an increase of pension to Phillip Dumont;
 H. R. 16632. An act granting an increase of pension to Louis Lepine;
 H. R. 16648. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Teetor;

H. R. 16699. An act granting an increase of pension to Lewis P. Chandler;
 H. R. 16717. An act granting an increase of pension to Sterling Hughes;
 H. R. 16724. An act granting an increase of pension to James S. Burgess;
 H. R. 16749. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry A. Jones;
 H. R. 16751. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel Hough;
 H. R. 16765. An act granting an increase of pension to Angus Campbell;
 H. R. 16783. An act granting an increase of pension to David W. Kirkpatrick;
 H. R. 16806. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Brenizer;
 H. R. 16810. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Jackson;
 H. R. 16824. An act granting an increase of pension to James Waskom;
 H. R. 16828. An act granting an increase of pension to Georgia A. Hughes;
 H. R. 16881. An act granting an increase of pension to Joel R. Youngkin;
 H. R. 16884. An act granting an increase of pension to William D. Woodcock;
 H. R. 16887. An act granting an increase of pension to Darwin Johnson;
 H. R. 16902. An act granting an increase of pension to Dennis Winn;
 H. R. 16936. An act granting an increase of pension to Sherwood F. Culberson;
 H. R. 16941. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Hogan;
 H. R. 16991. An act granting an increase of pension to Stephen Vaught;
 H. R. 16992. An act granting an increase of pension to John R. Baldwin;
 H. R. 16993. An act granting an increase of pension to Melroe Tarter;
 H. R. 16994. An act granting an increase of pension to Harriet Payne;
 H. R. 16996. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Delisle;
 H. R. 17003. An act granting an increase of pension to Eleazer C. Harmon;
 H. R. 17004. An act granting an increase of pension to Willard F. Sessions;
 H. R. 17006. An act granting an increase of pension to Fountain M. Fain;
 H. R. 17012. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Thackara;
 H. R. 17014. An act granting an increase of pension to Jackson D. Thornton;
 H. R. 17035. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel Smith;
 H. R. 17036. An act granting an increase of pension to Josephine L. Jordan;
 H. R. 17055. An act granting an increase of pension to George Fankell;
 H. R. 17067. An act granting an increase of pension to Simeon Pierce;
 H. R. 17069. An act granting an increase of pension to William L. Wilcher;
 H. R. 17070. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Blakney;
 H. R. 17085. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Ollis;
 H. R. 17118. An act granting an increase of pension to John Burke;
 H. R. 17143. An act granting an increase of pension to William Taylor;
 H. R. 17144. An act granting an increase of pension to Jesse Wiley;
 H. R. 17162. An act granting an increase of pension to Scott Ruddick;
 H. R. 17165. An act granting an increase of pension to Sophie Pohlers;
 H. R. 17173. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Davis;
 H. R. 17174. An act granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel C. Sawyer;
 H. R. 17175. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew E. Kinney;
 H. R. 17202. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin H. Cool;

H. R. 17209. An act granting an increase of pension to Alva D. Smith;
 H. R. 17229. An act granting an increase of pension to Derias Thomas Jean;
 H. R. 17231. An act granting an increase of pension to Rachel Allen;
 H. R. 17238. An act granting an increase of pension to John G. Vassar;
 H. R. 17244. An act granting an increase of pension to James Crandol;
 H. R. 17268. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Westfall;
 H. R. 17278. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Patterson;
 H. R. 17303. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Hester;
 H. R. 17310. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis A. Hite;
 H. R. 17333. An act granting an increase of pension to Esek W. Hoff;
 H. R. 17342. An act granting an increase of pension to Wesley G. Cox;
 H. R. 17344. An act granting an increase of pension to John L. Fuhrman;
 H. R. 17361. An act granting an increase of pension to Margaret McGiffin;
 H. R. 17372. An act granting an increase of pension to Arethusa M. Pettit;
 H. R. 17373. An act granting an increase of pension to William T. Stott;
 H. R. 17384. An act granting an increase of pension to William Warnes;
 H. R. 17385. An act granting an increase of pension to James S. Ruby;
 H. R. 17387. An act granting an increase of pension to David F. Eakin;
 H. R. 17395. An act granting an increase of pension to Thaddeus C. S. Brown;
 H. R. 17402. An act granting an increase of pension to Isalah H. Hazlitt;
 H. R. 17406. An act granting an increase of pension to William B. McAllister;
 H. R. 17422. An act granting an increase of pension to Orlando Hand;
 H. R. 17430. An act granting an increase of pension to John A. Mather;
 H. R. 17480. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles P. Lord;
 H. R. 17514. An act granting an increase of pension to Virginia C. Moore;
 H. R. 17515. An act granting an increase of pension to John J. Elliott;
 H. R. 17526. An act granting an increase of pension to Richard Dunlap;
 H. R. 17557. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Marshall;
 H. R. 17584. An act granting an increase of pension to James White;
 H. R. 17591. An act granting an increase of pension to William Hall;
 H. R. 17592. An act granting an increase of pension to Margaret Haynes;
 H. R. 17597. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Lee;
 H. R. 17613. An act granting an increase of pension to Susan E. Nash;
 H. R. 17619. An act granting an increase of pension to Davia D. Spain;
 H. R. 17635. An act granting an increase of pension to George Willy;
 H. R. 17638. An act granting an increase of pension to York A. Woodward;
 H. R. 17644. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Eastler;
 H. R. 17650. An act granting an increase of pension to Hugh F. Ames;
 H. R. 17654. An act granting an increase of pension to Hannah J. K. Thomas;
 H. R. 17683. An act granting an increase of pension to John Hoch;
 H. R. 17684. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Hays;
 H. R. 17700. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew T. Mitchell;
 H. R. 17711. An act granting an increase of pension to John Dietz;

H. R. 17736. An act granting an increase of pension to Josephine B. Phelon;
 H. R. 17747. An act granting an increase of pension to Abraham I. Canary;
 H. R. 17761. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Mackey;
 H. R. 17771. An act granting an increase of pension to Deloss Williams;
 H. R. 17781. An act granting an increase of pension to Frank M. Parker;
 H. R. 17782. An act granting an increase of pension to Aaron K. Clark;
 H. R. 17796. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Alexander;
 H. R. 17797. An act granting an increase of pension to Wilbur F. Lane;
 H. R. 17806. An act granting an increase of pension to Enoch Boyle;
 H. R. 17830. An act granting an increase of pension to William R. Snell;
 H. R. 17843. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel Watkins;
 H. R. 17854. An act granting an increase of pension to John Eubank;
 H. R. 17855. An act granting an increase of pension to Harriet E. Miller;
 H. R. 17890. An act granting an increase of pension to James T. Bandy;
 H. R. 17892. An act granting an increase of pension to Abraham K. Smith;
 H. R. 17913. An act granting an increase of pension to Philo Green;
 H. R. 17921. An act granting an increase of pension to James Reppeto;
 H. R. 17933. An act granting an increase of pension to Harriet E. Vandine;
 H. R. 17939. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert A. Seaver;
 H. R. 17950. An act granting an increase of pension to James W. Hager;
 H. R. 17951. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Hodges;
 H. R. 17971. An act granting an increase of pension to James G. Wall;
 H. R. 17989. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Hodges;
 H. R. 17996. An act granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Wells;
 H. R. 18006. An act granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Bass;
 H. R. 18019. An act granting an increase of pension to Milton A. Griffith;
 H. R. 18032. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary H. Scott;
 H. R. 18054. An act granting an increase of pension to Stewart J. Donnelly;
 H. R. 18056. An act granting an increase of pension to Moses Davis;
 H. R. 18067. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Gulott;
 H. R. 18075. An act granting an increase of pension to Anna E. Kingston;
 H. R. 18094. An act granting an increase of pension to William G. Melick;
 H. R. 18143. An act granting an increase of pension to James F. Brown;
 H. R. 18147. An act granting an increase of pension to Perry F. Belden;
 H. R. 18149. An act granting an increase of pension to S. Horace Perry;
 H. R. 18175. An act granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Van Riper;
 H. R. 18188. An act granting an increase of pension to David B. Guthrie;
 H. R. 18237. An act granting an increase of pension to Rachel Egeness;
 H. R. 18325. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Schofield;
 H. R. 18393. An act granting an increase of pension to David F. Crouch;
 H. R. 18406. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew Jackson;
 H. R. 18465. An act granting an increase of pension to Abby B. Cloud;

XL—463

H. R. 18506. An act granting an increase of pension to Mahala Jones;

H. R. 9138. An act granting an increase of pension to Aaron L. Rockwood;

H. R. 19572. An act making appropriations to supply additional urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1906, and for other purposes;

H. R. 18328. An act to regulate the practice in certain civil and criminal cases in the western district of Arkansas; and

H. R. 9135. An act granting a pension to August Crome.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 4403. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States," approved March 3, 1903—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

S. 350. An act for the relief of the heirs of Joseph Sierra, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1570. An act granting an increase of pension to Lydia A. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 5675. An act for the relief of Maj. Seymour Howell, United States Army, retired—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 5561. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to incorporate the Masonic Mutual Relief Association of the District of Columbia,'" approved February 5, 1901—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1476. An act granting certain lands to the town of Tincup, Colo., for cemetery purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 5772. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H. R. 16307. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to have a survey made of unsurveyed public lands in the State of Louisiana;

H. R. 9297. An act for the relief of Henry E. Rhoades, assistant engineer, United States Navy, retired; and

H. R. 18435. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to cooperate, through the Bureau of the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Bureau of Fisheries, with the shellfish commissioners of the State of Maryland in making surveys of the natural oyster beds, bars, and rocks in the waters within the State of Maryland.

NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 15332) to incorporate the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, with Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Connecticut.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS), there were—ayes 56, noes 35.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of James M. Thomason against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Robert A. Dickson against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered

to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17511), reported in lieu thereof a bill (H. R. 19642) to regulate the keeping of employment agencies in the District of Columbia where fees are charged for procuring employment or situations, reported the same, accompanied by a report (No. 4402); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SLAYDEN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 160) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish a certain gun carriage to the mayor of the city of Ripley, Lauderdale County, Tenn., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4406); which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAMILTON, from the Committee on the Territories, to which was referred the Senate joint resolution (S. R. 59) relative to the appropriation for the native schools and reindeer enterprise in Alaska, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4407); which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GROSVENOR, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4299) to amend section 4421 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, inspection of steam vessels, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4409); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5489) to provide for sittings of the circuit and district courts of the southern district of Florida in the city of Miami, in said district, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4410); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WALDO, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19606) to pay certain claims of citizens of foreign countries against the United States and to satisfy certain conventional obligations of the United States, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4414); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BARTLETT, from the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions, to which was referred the House concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 28) authorizing participation in an exposition at Tampa, Fla., to celebrate the beginning of work on the Panama Canal, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4416); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the Senate joint resolution (S. R. 47) granting condemned cannon for a statue to Governor Stevens T. Mason, of Michigan, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4418); which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4279) to correct the military record of Wilbur C. Stephens, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4405); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HERMANN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8825) for the relief of Thomas H. Kent, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4408); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WALDO, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9289) for the relief of the Mitsui Bussan Kaisha, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4411); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12188) for the relief of George T. Larkin, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4412); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13605) to satisfy certain claims against the Government arising under the Navy Department, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4413); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19641) for the relief of José Ramos, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4415); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CAPRON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13142) for the relief of Daniel B. Murphy, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4417); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, adverse reports were delivered to the Clerk, and laid on the table, as follows:

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14850) to remove the charge of desertion and grant an honorable discharge to Allen C. Newland, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 4403); which said bill and report were ordered laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12185) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Peter Ghem, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 4404); which said bill and report were ordered laid on the table.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio, from the Committee on the District of Columbia: A bill (H. R. 19642) to regulate the keeping of employment agencies in the District of Columbia where fees are charged for procuring employment or situations—to the House Calendar.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 19643) to permit homestead settlers on public lands in certain counties of Florida to sell and dispose of certain timber thereon—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 19644) directing the Office of Public Roads of the Agricultural Department to advise and cooperate with State and local authorities as to the best methods of maintaining roads used as rural routes in passable condition, and to inspect and report the condition of said roads with recommendations to the Post-Office Department when requested by it to do so—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CALDER: A bill (H. R. 19645) making Saturday afternoon a legal holiday, with pay, for employees in navy-yards and naval stations—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 19646) to amend section 4 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the final disposition of the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes," approved April 26, 1906—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. REYNOLDS: A bill (H. R. 19647) to increase the pay of letter carriers at offices of postmasters of the second class whenever such postmasters shall be advanced to the first class—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A resolution (H. Res. 539) providing for the pay of the two chief pages of the House—to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AIKEN: A bill (H. R. 19648) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Wilson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 19649) granting a pension to Robert H. Meister—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 19650) granting an increase of pension to A. W. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER: A bill (H. R. 19651) granting a pension to Joseph H. Pendergast—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 19652) granting an increase of pension to Lewis F. Ross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19653) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Murphy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DIXON of Montana: A bill (H. R. 19654) withdrawing from entry certain public lands in Choteau County, Mont., and leasing the same to the Board of Trustees of the Montana Agricultural College—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19655) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Martz—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARBER: A bill (H. R. 19656) granting an increase of pension to G. M. Ricker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19657) for the relief of David W. Stockstill—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 19658) granting an increase of pension to Ary S. Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEIFER: A bill (H. R. 19659) granting an increase of pension to Margaret S. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KLINE: A bill (H. R. 19660) granting an increase of pension to John Gettman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 19661) granting an increase of pension to Jacob McWilliams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 19662) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Kircher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCCREARY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 19663) granting a pension to Ellen A. Corrie—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 19664) granting an increase of pension to David Ayres—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE: A bill (H. R. 19665) granting a pension to Florence A. Pickering—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19666) granting a pension to Nannie R. Harrison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLMSTED: A bill (H. R. 19667) granting an increase of pension to John T. Boyle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 19668) for the relief of the estate of John P. Kelly—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 19669) to provide an American register for the steam yacht Waturus—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 19670) granting a pension to Maria Rogers—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 19671) to correct the military record of Charles Puseker—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALDO: A bill (H. R. 19672) granting an increase of pension to Thomas McDermott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., for preservation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. AIKEN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Sarah C. Wilson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BATES: Petition of C. E. Thompson, master of Grange No. 110, of Spartansburg, Pa., for the Heyburn pure-food bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Frank H. Jones, for the bill to extend additional bounty under the act of July 28, 1866 (S. Doc. 166), allowing \$100 to all ex-soldiers of the civil war entitled to \$100 by the terms of their enlistment and that had expired by the statute of limitation—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: Resolution of the American Peace Society, opposing appropriation for new battle ships—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Petition of labor organizations in Pensacola, Fla., for the eight-hour law—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. DUNWELL: Petition of the Iron Trade Review, favoring the pending ship subsidy bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Outdoor Art League and the California Club, favoring legislation giving California 5 per cent of the sale of her Government lands—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of the National Metal Trades Association, for bill S. 529 (the Gallinger bill in aid of the American merchant marine)—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the San Francisco Outdoor Art League, for legislation granting 5 per cent of the sale of California public lands to that State—to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. GAINES of West Virginia: Petition of John P. Dent

and 13 other druggists of Charleston, W. Va., for bill H. R. 8102 (the Mann bill)—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. GRANGER: Petition of the Kent Improvement Association, of East Greenwich, R. I., for forest reservations in the White and the Appalachian mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEVER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Elizabeth Mooney—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Elizabeth Mooney—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the Outdoor Art League and the California Club, favoring legislation giving 5 per cent of the public-land sales of California to that State—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MACON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of heirs of James Downs and Christine Downs, of Monroe County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. REYNOLDS: Petition of 204 citizens of Altoona, Pa., against sale of liquor in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of Cambria Grange, No. 1116, of Pennsylvania, indorsing the views of President Roosevelt on the railway-rate question—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the publishers of Johnstown, Pa., for an amendment to the post-office laws making all paid subscriptions legitimate—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of C. Wenderoth and 13 others, against an amendment to the Lacey bill (Government reserves to be game reservations)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 204 citizens of Altoona, Pa., for Sunday closing of the Jamestown Exposition—to the Select Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. SAMUEL: Petition of Greenbriar (Pa.) Grange, No. 1148, Patrons of Husbandry, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturalized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Greenbriar (Pa.) Grange, No. 1148, against the ship-subsidy bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: Petition of James N. Barnhill, against the tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, May 25, 1906.

Prayer by Right Rev. HENRY Y. SATTERLEE, Bishop of Washington.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. KEAN, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Journal stands approved.

GAZETTEER OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, inclosing a copy of a proposed concurrent resolution providing for the printing and binding of 5,000 copies of the Gazetteer of the Philippine Islands revised to January 1, 1906, with suitable maps and charts, together with a memorandum giving the successive steps leading to the former edition, as well as the work on this revision and its intended scope; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of The Trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Culpeper, Va., v. The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the cause of The Trustees of the Presbyterian Church of Fredericksburg, Va., v. The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. Browning, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

S. 4129. An act to regulate enlistments and punishments in the United States Revenue-Cutter Service;